

Mr. PHIPPS. Oh, no; it contains a general authorization which would make an appropriation for a project of this kind available without a separate bill.

Mr. WHEELER. Then I will let it go over.

Mr. FESS. I should like to have the two bills go over until to-morrow, at least, if the Senator pleases.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate bill 1785, the title of which has just been stated, and Senate bill 4002, providing for the construction of roads on the Rocky Boy Indian Reservation in the State of Montana, will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7933) to provide for an assistant to the Chief of Naval Operations was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE, NEW MARTINSVILLE, W. VA.

The bill (S. 3638) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near New Martinsville, W. Va., was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I notice that there are House bills on the calendar which seem to correspond to the bill of which the title has just been read and the one following it. If that is the case, I suggest that the Senate bills should be indefinitely postponed and the House bills acted on.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, House bill 9850 is just the same as the Senate bill. I move the postponement of the Senate bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, House bill 9850 will be substituted for Senate bill 3638.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9850) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near New Martinsville, W. Va.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 3638 will be indefinitely postponed.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE, MOUNDSVILLE, W. VA.

The bill (S. 3754) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Moundsville, W. Va., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the same course will be followed in the case of this bill, and House bill 10248 will be substituted.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 10248) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Moundsville, W. Va.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 3754 will be indefinitely postponed.

PROVISION OF BOOKS FOR ADULT BLIND

The bill (S. 4030) to provide books for the adult blind was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Library of Congress, in addition to appropriations otherwise made to said Library, the sum of \$100,000, which sum shall be expended under the direction of the Librarian of Congress to provide books for the use of the adult blind residents of the United States, including the several States, Territories, insular possessions, and the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. The Librarian of Congress may arrange with such libraries as he may judge appropriate to serve as local or regional centers for the circulation of such books, under such conditions and regulations as he may prescribe. In the lending of such books preference shall at all times be given to the needs of blind persons who have been honorably discharged from the United States military or naval service.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7390) to authorize the appointment of an assistant commissioner of education in the Department of the Interior was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let that bill go over.

The bill (S. 3054) to increase the salaries of certain postmasters of the first class was announced as next in order.

Mr. TRAMMELL. At the request of the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL], who is necessarily absent from the Chamber, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over. That completes the calendar.

THE LOWER RIO GRANDE, THE LOWER COLORADO, AND THE TIA JUANA RIVERS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I ask that the report of the International Waterway Commission, made under provision of law and transmitted by the Secretary of State and by the President, be made a Senate document, together with the letters of transmittal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate carry out the unanimous-consent agreement and adjourn until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), under the order previously made, adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 13, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord, we are not afraid to come to Thee because we are inferior. Thy love and mercy, we trust, have taken away the sense of fear. We thank Thee for such tides of graciousness. As the tiniest flower turns toward the sun, so in Thy presence we thank Thee for what Thou art, and may we forget what we are. Bless all classes of our citizens. May education prevail that our whole land receive its blessings. Remember especially the poor, the ignorant, the needy, and those who are subject to violent wrongs inflicted by their own passions. Teach us all that the big things in life are contentment, a fine appreciation, a serene mind, and a large vision. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 9, 1930, was read and approved.

WAR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 7955, the War Department appropriation bill, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7955) making appropriations for the military and non-military activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman from California talked with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS] about this?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes. I have talked with the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. GARNER. They are both agreed?

Mr. BARBOUR. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker announced as the conferees on the part of the House Mr. BARBOUR, Mr. CLAGUE, Mr. TABER, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. WRIGHT.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 8531, the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8531) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOOD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the statement be read in lieu of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement.

The statement was read.

(For text of conference report and accompanying statement, see House proceedings of May 1, 1930.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

PENSIONS

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 11588, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 11588, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11588) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 13, strike out lines 22 to 25, inclusive; page 38, strike out lines 7 to 10, inclusive; page 41, strike out lines 14 to 17, inclusive; page 88, strike out lines 19 to 22, inclusive; page 134, strike out lines 15 to 19, inclusive; page 137, strike out lines 22 to 25, inclusive; page 143, strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive; page 145, strike out lines 17 to 20, inclusive; page 157, strike out lines 18 to 21, inclusive; page 180, strike out lines 22 to 25, inclusive; page 181, strike out lines 22 to 24, inclusive, and lines 1 and 2, page 182; page 203, after line 3, insert:

"The name of Adella Legrow, helpless child of Samuel H. Legrow, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Nancy S. Walker, widow of Richard A. Walker, late of Captain Edleman's Company A, Cavalry Detachment Sixty-fourth Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of William M. Atchison, late of Capt. George R. Barber's Fleming County, Ky., State troops, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

"The name of John Cook, late of Captain Walker's company for volunteers, attached to One hundred and ninetieth Regiment Twenty-seventh Brigade, Fifth Division West Virginia Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

"The name of Harriet J. Ball, widow of Robert E. Ball, late of Troop E, Eleventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Matilda Ann Price, widow of John H. Price, late of Company C, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Mary J. D. Buzzell, widow of Warren I. Buzzell, late of Company C, Twenty-eighth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Frank H. Greenough, widow of Milton E. Greenough, late of Company E, One hundred and second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Cornelia L. Hough, widow of Daniel H. Hough, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Catherine M. Hayward, widow of George F. Hayward, late of Company C, Sixtieth Regiment Massachusetts Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Mary J. Baldwin, widow of Amzi W. Baldwin, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Alice V. Stanley, widow of Henry C. Stanley, late of Captain Degg's company, Fifth Battalion, District of Columbia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Marinda O. Miles, widow of William H. Miles, late of Company C, Twenty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Rosetta Barnes, widow of Newton Z. Barnes, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Peter B. Coleman, late of Company F, Sixty-third Regiment Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

"The name of Ann Eliza McClung, widow of William McClung, late of Capt. James R. Ramsey's company, West Virginia State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Alta K. Conley, widow of James H. Conley, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month, and \$30 when it is shown she has attained the age of 60 years.

"The name of Hattie Smith, widow of Harrison Smith, late of Company E, Thirty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Margaret A. Ridgway, widow of George B. Ridgway, late of Company H, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Otilia H. Smith, widow of Amos T. Smith, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Catherine J. Belden, widow of Henry C. Belden, late of Company D, Fifty-second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Winifred Wallace, widow of Michael D. Wallace, late of Company F, Thirty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Emma F. McLaughry, widow of Robert W. McLaughry, late of Company B, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Amanda A. McKinney, helpless child of Joseph McKinney, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Jane Kelley, widow of John Kelley, late of Troop B, First Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of George C. Hall, helpless child of Thomas B. Hall, late of Company I, Eighteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

"The name of Samantha V. Cooper, widow of Charles C. Cooper, late of Company I, One hundred and ninety-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Martha J. Underwood, widow of Ellis Underwood, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Bertha C. Riley, helpless child of John Wesley Riley, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Nancy Blitz, widow of Charles Blitz, late of Company C, Sixty-seventh Regiment New York National Guard Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Rosetta Emery, widow of Samuel A. Emery, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Sarah J. Wells, widow of Samuel Wells, late of Company C, Thirty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Lizzie Wright, widow of William S. Wright, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Silas W. Kelly, late of Capt. Joshua C. Perkins's Company C, Harlan County Battalion Kentucky State Guards, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

"The name of Sarah Meadors, former widow of Samuel Freeman, late of Company B, Hall's Gap Battalion, Kentucky Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Manerva Morgan, widow of John H. Morgan, late of Capt. William Eversoles's Company C, Three Forks Battalion, Kentucky State Troops, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Jennie Riley, widow of Philip Riley, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Ellen J. Strong, helpless child of Charles B. Strong, late of Company K, One hundred and sixty-fourth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Mary J. Perry, widow of Oran Perry, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Jessie May Bennett, widow of Amos F. Bennett, late of Company M, Fiftieth Regiment New York Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month, and \$30 when she has attained the age of 60 years.

"The name of Adaline Hendrixson, widow of Francis M. Hendrixson, late of Company B, Fifty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Abbie W. Mudgett, widow of Henry E. Mudgett, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Josephine Chapman, widow of James W. Chapman, late of Company A, Seventh-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Elizabeth Tasher, widow of John C. Tasher, late of Company B, Forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Elsie E. Bradd, widow of James H. Bradd, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Fannie Badders, widow of James M. Badders, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Matilda LaCoss, widow of Adolph LaCoss, late of Company E, Sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Emma E. Waldo, widow of Dillingham Waldo, late of Company E, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and the pension of the helpless child continued.

"The name of Malenda Lendormi, widow of Paulin Lendormi, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Johanna Sherer, widow of Peter Sherer, late of Company B, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Amelia Lines, widow of Elliott Lines, late of Company G, Thirty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Josephine F. Gibson, widow of Archibald Gibson, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Nellie A. Getchell, helpless child of Charles O. Getchell, late of Company F, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Leacy V. Welch, former widow of Lorenzo D. Gilbreath, late of Troop E, Third Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Susan Shores, widow of Ethan P. Shores, late of Company K, Eighth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Annie Gilmore, widow of Milton Gilmore, late of Company A, Thirty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Marion J. Ellis, widow of Abram H. Ellis, late of Troop C, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Aletha E. Eakes, widow of Joseph R. Eakes, late of Company C, Seventy-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Laura B. Strider, former widow of Jasper W. Reed, late of Company B, Forty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Jennie Lochray, widow of Archie Lochray, late of Company H, Eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Jemima Colver Rose, former widow of Lewellyn Colver, late of Company I, First Regiment Oregon Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Catharine Moxley, widow of Willis Moxley, late of Company D, One hundredth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Nellie L. Dowlan, widow of William Dowlan, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Catherine J. Wilson, widow of Addison W. Wilson, late of Company K, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Mary J. Clark, widow of Granville P. Clark, late of Troop A, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Anna K. Gleitch, widow of George S. Gleitch, late of Company G, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Caroline Brunson, widow of Theophilus G. Brunson, late of Company H, Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Emma G. Heffner, widow of James Heffner, late of Company L, Third Regiment of Pennsylvania Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Eliza I. Duff, widow of William M. Duff, late of Company D, Twenty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Frances E. O'Brien, widow of David O'Brien, late of Company K, Twentieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and the helpless child, Leona, to \$20 per month subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

"The name of Mary H. White, widow of William W. White, late of Company L, Fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Mary M. Battis, widow of Wilkins M. Battis, late of Company C, Nineteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Georgetta Fuller, widow of Ezra B. Fuller, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of William L. Ross, enlisted under the name of William A. Murray, late of Ninety-third Regiment New York Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

"The name of Ruth E. Richardson, widow of Jabez T. Richardson, late of Troop K, First Regiment Connecticut Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Nellie E. Withey, widow of Elbridge Withey, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Ellen C. Riley, widow of Edward Riley, late of Troop I, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Cynthia F. Knapp, widow of Devillo Knapp, late of Company K, Sixty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Rosanna Bishop, widow of Edwin M. Bishop, late of Company I, One hundred and eighty-ninth Regiment New York Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Anna B. Flaherty, widow of Michael Flaherty, late of Company K, Twenty-eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month, and \$30 when 60 years of age.

"The name of Susan A. May, widow of Charles H. May, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Sarah Connell, widow of John Connell, late of Company M, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Margaret A. Day, widow of Carlos P. Day, late of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Mary E. Hinchman, widow of Joseph E. Hinchman, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Alice Howard, widow of James P. Howard, late of band, Seventh Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Anna P. Fuller, widow of Samuel G. Fuller, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her

a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Matilda A. Riggs, widow of James Riggs, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving, and pension of helpless child to continue.

"The name of Lilly Long, widow of William Long, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Laura R. Slater, widow of Thomas J. Slater, late of Troop A, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Emily A. Foster, widow of William Foster, late of Company B, Thirtieth Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Nannie Fry, widow of William Fry, late of Battery G, First Regiment United States Colored Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Ella J. C. Perry, widow of Leonard Perry, late of Company A, Twenty-fifth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Mary E. Tolbert, widow of Harris F. Tolbert, late of Company B, Twenty-eighth Regiment North Carolina Infantry Confederate States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Hannah P. Ramsey, widow of James Newton Ramsey, late of Company I, Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Catherine M. Brown, widow of Henry E. Brown, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Margaret McElroy, widow of William McElroy, late of Company D, Cass County, Missouri Home Guards Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Lucy L. Hamm Vaughan, widow of George M. Vaughan, alias Vaughn, late of Fifth Military District, Enrolled Missouri Militia, staff of Brig. Gen. R. C. Vaughn, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Demarious Harris, widow of Isaac N. Harris, late of Company B, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Mary C. Morris, widow of Henry Morris, late of Troop K, Seventh Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Birdie Springsteen, widow of Abram F. Springsteen, late of Company A, Thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month and \$30 per month when she has attained the age of 60 years.

"The name of Pheba Whitman, widow of John B. Whitman, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Ruth R. Nash, widow of Nathan E. Nash, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Susan A. Kurtz, widow of Henry Kurtz, late of Company G, Twenty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Sarah P. Abrel, widow of Graffenburg Abrel, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Charlie Hyden, helpless child of John H. Hyden, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Priscilla Elmore, helpless child of Jesse Elmore, late of Battery B, First Regiment Kentucky Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Priscilla Wilson, widow of Alexander H. Wilson, late of Company C, Third Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Sarah Higgins, widow of Parley E. Higgins, late of Troop L, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Lottie A. Crouch, helpless child of Charles H. Crouch, late of Company B, Maine Coast Guards, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Rebecca A. Wright, widow of Thomas W. Wright, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Wilson H. Spangenberg, dependent child of George W. Spangenberg, late of Company G, Twenty-sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Emma Fitch, widow of John Fitch, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Priscilla Mayer, widow of Philip Mayer, late of Second Independent Battery, Massachusetts Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Martha Gaggin, former widow of William Leonard Ford, late of Company A, Seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Lucinda M. Hanna, widow of James W. Hanna, late of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Lillie Wootan, widow of Daniel Wootan, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Ollie P. Stallings, widow of David R. Stallings, late of Troop E, Eighth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Maggie M. Phillips, widow of Isaac N. Phillips, late of Troop A, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Miranda J. Pickle, widow of Gabriel Pickle, late of Company B, Fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Nancy Beth, widow of William Beth, late of Troop E, Sixth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Kate F. Thorn, widow of David C. Thorn, late of Company C, Eighty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Martha E. Crawford, widow of William O. Crawford, late of Company D, One hundred and seventy-ninth Regiment New York Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Mary Ida Jordan, widow of George E. Jordan, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of J. Alfred Perry, helpless child of James E. Perry, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Sarah E. Emmert, widow of Daniel Emmert, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Margaret Galvin, helpless child of Daniel Galvin, late of Company B, Ninetieth Regiment of Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Matilda Brown, widow of John Brown, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Emma Turner, widow of Washington Turner, late of Company F, Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Myron Gibson, helpless child of Thomas Gibson, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Joab Carr, Jr., late of Capt. Nathan J. Lambert's Independent Scouts, Tucker County, West Virginia State Troops, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

"The name of Hettie A. Kyker, widow of Thomas J. Kyker, late of Troop C, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Caroline Hoyt, widow of Charles L. Hoyt, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Amanda Metcalf, helpless child of Amos Metcalf, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Manda Jane Stringer, helpless child of William Stringer, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Sarah J. Ravlin, former widow of Robert McCollom, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment New York Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Henrietta Trate, widow of Lot Trate, late of Company D, Fifty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Elizabeth Bartley, widow of Jeremiah J. Bartley, late of Company K, Second Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Mary J. Edwards, widow of Edmond Edwards, late of Troop A, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Emma F. Shilling, widow of John Shilling, late of Company H, Third Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Anna B. Collins, widow of Anderson F. Collins, late of Company F, Seventieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Rebecca Barnes, widow of Cassius M. Barnes, late of Captain Holland's Company, Michigan Mounted Engineers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Rachel Morgan, widow of Edwin D. Morgan, late of Company B, Eighty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Elizabeth Butler, widow of James Butler, late of Company A, Sixty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of William Fay, helpless child of Aaron Fay, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

"The name of Mary E. Stone, former widow of James Cook, late of Company F, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Sarah Ann Owens, widow of Patrick Owens, late of Company B, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Mary P. Law, widow of James B. Law, late of Company F, Twenty-second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

"The name of Sarah P. Denham, former widow of Thompson Denham, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Emeline Keeling, widow of Dexter Keeling, late of Company C, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Cornelia F. Grove, widow of Leonard S. Grove, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Elizabeth J. Mills, widow of George L. Mills, late of Troop K, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of Rachel A. Moffitt, widow of Hugh Moffitt, late of Company E, Twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

"The name of William A. Rowin, helpless child of William Rowin, late of Troop B, Second Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

BYRD ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 327, authorizing the presentation of medals to the officers and men of the Byrd Antarctic expedition.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) authorizing the presentation of medals to the officers and men of the Byrd Antarctic expedition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that this is a matter of urgency?

Mr. CABLE. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, empowered and directed to cause to be made at the United States mint such number of gold, silver, and bronze medals as he may deem appropriate and necessary respectively to be presented to the officers and men of the Byrd Antarctic expedition to express the high admiration in which the Congress and the American people hold their heroic and undaunted services in connection with the scientific investigations and extraordinary aerial explorations of the Antarctic continent, under the personal direction of Rear Admiral Richard E. Byrd, said medals to be suitably inscribed.

With a committee amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "Treasury" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Navy."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That such amount as may be necessary for the purchase of the necessary materials for said medals is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. CABLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CABLE: Page 2, line 7, strike out the words "purchase of the necessary material for" and insert the words "cost of."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

SOVIET PROPAGANDA DOCUMENTS

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for eight minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] asks unanimous consent to proceed for eight minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the country was somewhat startled by an announcement made by the commissioner of police of the city of New York that he had seized some documents purporting to show that a New York corporation, Amtorg, was connected directly in subversive propaganda work in the United States. He had a hearing before the Committee on Immigration in executive session, but at the same time released to the press of the country photostatic copies of documents which purported to show the activities of communistic propaganda throughout the country through this agency.

I am informed by Mr. Harold Swain, managing editor of the New York Graphic, that one of his men discovered the printing press in New York City where the original letterheads on which the alleged orders from Moscow were printed; that he called this discovery to the attention of the commissioner of police before coming to Washington; that he asked one of his men, Mr. Joe Cohn, to report to Mr. Whalen, and offered his information for comparison with the original of the letterheads he had obtained from the New York printer; that he himself, Mr. Swain, on the morning that the commissioner of police came to Washington called at his home at 6 o'clock in the morning, and offered to compare or give the commissioner an opportunity to compare his records with the samples said to have been printed in New York. I think I am safe in saying that our Department of State had an opportunity of knowing about these alleged records purporting to come from Moscow, and has given no credence to them at all. The fact remains, however, that many people became alarmed when the commissioner of police came to a committee of the House and these documents were presented to the committee. I would suggest to the Committee on Immigration

that the authenticity of the Whalen Russian documents should be established. I will be glad to turn over the original letterhead proofs obtained by the New York Graphic. The Committee on Immigration should ask the police commissioner of New York to appear with his originals and a comparison could be made then and there. If the so-called Russian documents are faked or forgeries, the House and the country should be promptly informed.

I have in my hand the letterhead printed on East Tenth Street, New York City, an exact replica of the letterheads on which these mysterious letters or documents appeared. On the back of it there is a statement from the printer. I read:

I printed this about four months ago and submitted two copies as a proof, but the man did not come back for the order. Signed, M. Wagner, printer.

In other words, they ordered 500, I think. They paid something on account and went there and got proof copies the same as the copies I hold in my hand. If you will compare this letterhead with the photostatic copies which were given out to the press by the New York police, you will find certain printing characteristics which are identical. In fact, the one is a photostatic copy of the other. For instance, the dropping of a comma in the ditto mark; the falling of a dot in the line. There is no question that the photostatic copies which were given to the press by Mr. Whalen and exhibited by him to our Committee on Immigration were exact reproductions of the letterheads which I have in my hand, and which were printed in New York City and not in Moscow.

I hold no brief for the Amtorg. I do not know anything about them. I do not know anything about their activities here except that they are purchasing goods for Russia to the extent of \$150,000,000 or \$200,000,000 in this country every year.

I submit that when the police commissioner of New York City has some information to give to Congress, he ought to submit to every test before getting the country unduly exercised about the existence of communistic activities based on documents the authenticity of which he can not vouch for. The Amtorg is a New York corporation. If the police commissioner has any information that they are engaged in any activities which are unlawful, he can apply to the courts of New York through the attorney general of the State to dissolve the corporation. That way is open to him. If he claims any law of the United States has been violated, he should submit the facts to our Department of Justice. If he desires legislative action, he should be willing to prove the charges he makes.

I will hold these originals for the pleasure of the Committee on Immigration, and I will ask the Committee on Immigration to take these originals and compare them with the photostatic copies which they have, and I am sure they will be convinced that some one has sold the Police Department of New York City a gold brick. But Congress ought to know it because of the mysterious manner in which this hearing was held. First, the announcement of the discovery of the documents; then giving the documents to the press; and then the executive session between the police commissioner and the committee, and the suspicion aroused that some very dangerous documents had been seized.

The least we can do is to invite a comparison and determine the authenticity of these documents.

For that purpose I have asked this time, and for that purpose I am ready to submit these proofs to the committee.

Mr. JENKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. The chairman of the Committee on Immigration is not present at this time, and I am not authorized to speak for him or for the committee; but I am a member of the Committee on Immigration, and I may say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] that our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] will be glad to avail himself of any assistance that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] may render.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I received this information and these proofs from the managing editor of the New York Graphic, who conducted this investigation and who vouches for this information. I am sure he, too, will cooperate with the gentleman's committee.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] have any objection to furnishing whatever evidence he may have to the other committee that is considering the two resolutions to investigate Amtorg and such other activities?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. There is not any such committee that I know of.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The Rules Committee.

Mr. SABATH. I think that committee ought to have such information as the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] has in his possession, and additional information that it may be able to secure, because I think it would in a great measure aid the committee in passing upon the resolutions that are now before that committee.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes, indeed; I shall be pleased to submit these samples to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I was present at the hearing recently when the commissioner appeared, and he impressed me as one of the most able witnesses I have ever heard before a congressional committee. He impressed me as a man who is desirous of administering the laws of the land with all equity and justice, and I believe he will welcome any cooperation.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. It was offered to him, as I stated before, in New York by the Graphic.

Mr. GREEN. He seemed perfectly willing to reveal any information he could that would not conflict with prosecutions that were going on in New York.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. There are no prosecutions going on resulting or in connection with these alleged Russian documents.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

TAXATION BY EXECUTIVE FIAT

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a short article prepared by Mr. David H. Morton, of New York, upon the flexible clause of the tariff. I do not know the gentleman, but the article is well prepared, and I think it is worth reading in connection with the flexible clause now pending in Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

SHALL ONE MAN OR A COMMISSION OF BUREAUCRATIC EXPERTS ARBITRARILY EXERCISE THIS POWER TO DESTROY?

There was no executive power to change tariff rates under the Underwood Tariff Law. The Tariff Commission appointed by Woodrow Wilson was advisory. It merely compiled tariff statistics and collected information for the use of Congress. This useful, nonpartisan function it performed satisfactorily, without friction, internal or external. The repeal of the flexible provisions would restore the Tariff Commission to their original useful status. The first time in American history any executive official was given power to change an existing tax rate was in the flexible provisions of the tariff act of 1922, enacted by Congress at the request of President Harding.

This is the most dangerous, insidious of bureaucratic powers ever established by Federal act. Thus started, it is greatly broadened in the pending bill. It gives one man, the President of the United States, the power to make or break important importing and manufacturing interests by fixing, on an arbitrary formula, the customs tax rate for the future.

John Marshall said the power to tax is the power to destroy. This means that no court can set aside a tax because it confiscates property. In this the flexible tariff differs in toto from making interstate commerce rates for carriers which can never be confiscatory, or even arbitrary.

This is one of the most important governmental questions now up for discussion. This act sets up the discretion of one man instead of the fixed rule of law.

Congress "passed the buck," abdicated its power, and practically turned over the making of tariff laws to the President, assisted by the Tariff Commission.

The costs of the investigations are enormous, running into the hundreds of thousands, for the employment of a small army of investigators and field agents; reminding us that we seceded from Great Britain because the king sent "swarms of officers to harass our people and eat up their substance."

As a practical matter, it is impossible to find with accuracy the difference in competitive conditions at home and abroad, on a theoretical finding of which the action of the President is supposed to be based. Therefore, it gives an arbitrary and uncontrolled discretion to the President to fix the amount of the future customs-tax rate. That is taxation by Executive fiat.

Under the Fordney-McCumber Act of 1922 the formula was difference in costs of production at home and abroad. This, by legal fiction, to the effect that it merely authorized the President to find facts, was casually sustained by the courts. But the most ignorant can see that when the President fixes a new tariff tax based upon the supposed differences in competitive conditions he levies any tax he pleases. That is legislation. All deceit and camouflage was thrown aside when the

formula was changed from differences in production costs to differences in competitive conditions.

No one but a fool would argue that the latter sets up a fact-finding process.

The most ignorant can see that the differences in competitive conditions formula gives the President absolute and uncontrolled discretion to determine the amount of the tariff tax rate.

William McKinley accepted with some misgiving the advisory tariff commission bill of 1882 and in a speech to Congress said:

"I can not refrain from saying that we are taking a new and somewhat hazardous step in delegating a duty that we ought ourselves to perform—a duty confided to us by the Constitution, and to no others. It is true that a commission does not legislate, and therefore its work may or may not be adopted by Congress. This is the safety of the proposition. The information it will furnish will be important and its statistics of rare value, but the same sources of information are open to Congress and to the Committee on Ways and Means as will be available to a commission."

What would McKinley have thought of a commission with power to fix tariff rates, or of the present flexible scheme reposing such a power in the President?

Speaker Thomas Brackett Reed, in the *North American Review* of December, 1902, said:

"But we can have sitting in perpetual session a body of men nonpartisan, judicious, wise, and incorruptible. Yes, in your mind. You can have anything in your mind. Imagination is unlimited and it is very delightful to wander around among possible impossibilities. Just think of a nonpartisan free trader sitting on a tariff tax. Of course, he would be above any prejudice except his own. I saw one Tariff Commission sit in 1882, and its report was not enacted into law. All its mistakes were, and the result was satisfactory to nobody."

The flexible tariff should be repealed. It disturbs business and dampens business initiative. Changes in tariff rates once in a while by Congress are often bad enough, but the power to disturb business by changing tariff rates any time the executive functionaries see fit is worse. It spells bureaucracy in its worst form.

The investigations are largely secret. They have to be. It is not a lawsuit. It is an investigation looking to a change in the law. The Tariff Commission is not a court. The so-called hearing is merely to get additional information like a congressional committee hearing. It bears no possible resemblance to a court trial. Fixing the tax rate is a political act and can not be made into a litigation. The commission and the President may seek information by conversations with experts or with anyone else. Congress has to fix tariff rates in the open after full debate, and take the responsibility. To a considerable extent the flexible investigation must necessarily be *ex parte*.

This flexible scheme is no longer to be based upon supposed differences in cost of production. The law expressly directs the President to fix tariff rates which will equalize competitive conditions. This expression means anything one wishes it to mean. It is indefinite. It establishes no clear-cut rule of action. It is rank nonsense to call such an elastic formula a mere fact-finding process. Under it, within certain nominal limits, the President can do anything he likes, thus exercising an absolute uncontrolled discretion.

He can change the classification from one paragraph to another. He can change the *ad valorem* to the American valuation. This would often increase the duty several hundred per cent. That is no fact-finding process. It has the same effect as new legislation.

The mere threat to start an investigation for a change will put every importing and domestic industry affected in political fear of the will of the administration. This scheme sets up an executive political power over business, the like of which was never known in America; compared with which the worst possible manipulation of ordinary political spoils is harmless child's play.

Moreover, under any flexible scheme a Democratic President or commission could reduce duties over the heads of a Republican Congress, and a Republican President or commission could increase duties in defiance of a Democratic Congress. Such change in the tax rate by the Executive could not claim a popular sanction. It would lack the support and approval of the popular representatives intrusted by the Constitution with the taxing power.

How any believer in American institutions, Democrat or Republican, can stand for giving such drastic, autocratic power over American business to executive functionaries, be they commission or President, and whatever their ability and learning, is a mystery. It is supported by no orthodox Republican or Democratic doctrine. It has not a political leg to stand on.

This discussion does not involve the political question of "protection" or "tariff for revenue." The question of having a flexible tariff is a nonpartisan question.

If this is to remain a Government of laws and not of men, the flexible tariff must go. The most far-reaching governmental power, the power to tax is the power to destroy, is practically exercised behind the scenes, more or less in the dark, securely buried in the wilds of our circumlocution office at Washington. That is the worst form of Federal bureaucracy yet invented.

When the Federal bureaucrats arbitrarily construe or arbitrarily apply a tax law there is a judicial remedy to correct their action in the courts. But the act of fixing the future tax rate is, in its very nature, not subject to judicial review. It is not a justiciable matter. The courts can not be made to indirectly take part in the purely political act of fixing the future tax rate. Consequently when the President fixes the amount of a future tax rate he can wantonly and arbitrarily destroy my property or put me out of business, and I have no redress whatsoever.

This strikingly distinguishes such absolute, unrestrained power from the limited and restrained action of the Interstate Commerce Commission in fixing reasonable rates for carriers' public services, which can neither be confiscatory nor arbitrary. Moreover, the whole matter of thus fixing tariff rates through an Executive commission is so hidden, confused, and deceptive, so lost in the wilds of our circumlocution office in Washington, so irresponsible in its nature, that the citizen affected, perhaps put out of business, has practically no political redress for abuse of power. There is no one he can hold responsible politically.

This whole flexible-tariff business would have been anathema to Thomas Jefferson, to Samuel J. Tilden, to Grover Cleveland, and to most of our great Republican statesmen of former days. Have we now gone soft? If we are willing to have our very right to do business granted us by the favor of a commission of Washington bureaucratic experts, however upright or however learned, we might as well stop talking about American liberty and turn everything over to a dictator such as Lenin or Mussolini and be done with constitutional government.

The above explains why the present flexible tariff has not taken the tariff out of politics and why no flexible tariff can do so. The tariff is purely and necessarily a political question.

The Archangel Gabriel himself can not accurately find the supposed "differences in competitive conditions" without using a legislative discretion. To attempt tariff making by such a formula is unsound and impractical and grossly unfair to business.

Changing the personnel of the Tariff Commission can not help matters. That merely changes the men who shall do the guessing.

In his testimony before the special investigation committee, Thomas Walker Page said:

"I think that there are enough uncertainties in business, even under the best of conditions, and I think that the feeling of uncertainty and of insecurity is greatly increased when it is impossible for the producer to know at what time the rates of the tariff are going to be changed. When they feel, at least, that they are under a constant threat of a change in the tax on imports they can not with any feeling of safety make their commitments for future operations. It is, therefore, a deterrent to business. It prevents sound business. It adds a speculative interest which I think is highly undesirable. I might also say that one of the serious defects in the proposal for a flexible tariff is, as I have said elsewhere, the danger that the flexibility will be perverse. You can not make investigations which will justify a change in the rate until the period of production is completed to which the investigation relates. Now, the following period of production may be subject to conditions that are different from the period which has been under investigation. If, therefore, you change your rates so as to accord with results, or investigation, of one period, they might be totally wrong for the period which follows."

In conclusion there is a deliberate snake in the flexible provision which should be noticed. It professes to be a fair and equal scheme. It is not. As to every *ad valorem* rate the President may lower the existing rate 50 per cent. But when he comes to *ad valorem* rates he can go far above 50 per cent by shifting the duty to the so-called American selling price. That makes the scheme one-sided and unfair in operation.

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, I called to the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] certain legislation that had passed the Senate the day previous with reference to the construction of two bridges in Maryland. I told him at the time that I had information regarding the activities of certain individuals interested in the corporation seeking the franchises. I was assured by the gentleman from Illinois, as the *RECORD* will show, that I would be given an opportunity to appear before his committee prior to the reporting of the bills. The bills have been reported to the House, but the gentleman from Illinois did not keep the promise he made to me on the floor. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend my remarks in the *RECORD* and print the argument I proposed to submit to the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, if I had been given the opportunity.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing an argument he intended to make before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Is there objection?

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I object. I want to state, in view of what the gentleman from Missouri has said, that the failure of the committee to hear the gentleman was entirely an oversight, and if there is any parliamentary way it can be done I will ask that the bills be referred back to the committee, in order to give the gentleman from Missouri an opportunity to have a hearing. Can that be done?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 3421) to authorize the Tidewater Toll Properties (Inc.), its legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Choptank River at a point at or near Cambridge, Md., and the bill (S. 3422) to authorize the Tidewater Toll Properties (Inc.), its legal representatives and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Patuxent River, south of Burch, Calvert County, Md., be referred back to the committee for further hearing. There was no intention, of course, to prevent the gentleman from Missouri from being heard, but in the consideration of many other matters pending before the committee, the gentleman's request was overlooked. I want to give him ample opportunity to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the two bills referred to be recommitted to the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in consideration of certain District bills to-day the usual Consent Calendar rules may be used.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that such bills from the District Committee as may be offered to-day be considered under the rules relating to the Consent Calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—which I do not expect to do—I think this would be a good time to call to the attention of the House the conditions under which one District of Columbia bill passed this House the last time the District Committee had a day. A certain bill was reported to allow the Masonic Temple Association, in Washington, to erect a portion of their building higher than the building regulations of the District permit. When that bill came up for consideration, I asked for certain information, but the information given was not accurate. The gentleman who gave it to me was not at fault, because the plans of the association had not been fairly disclosed to the committee. By reason of the information given me I did not make the objection to the bill which I would have made. The bill passed and has become law. Since that time certain facts have been developed of which Congress was not aware. First, that instead of being simply a fraternal structure that would be an ornament to the city, in a conspicuous location, a part of the project is a commercial one, the erection of several apartment houses, so that Congress gave consent to an exception to the building regulations in connection with a commercial project. This Congress would not have done it if we had known the facts. Secondly, the portion of the structure that is to be higher than the building regulations would have permitted, as now planned by the architects, is to be practically a replica of the Lincoln Memorial.

In other words, we are permitting, in connection with a semi-fraternal and semicommercial project, the placing, in a very conspicuous part of the city, of a replica of the Lincoln Memorial, to some extent taking away the unique beauty that characterizes that structure. I do not know what authority, if any, the Fine Arts Commission and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission may have left to them, but I hope they have enough authority that they can prevent the desecration of the Lincoln Memorial by uniting it with this pending proposition. [Applause.] I think there ought not to have been that exception for any commercial project. However, that has gone by, and I only take this time to express the hope that the Committee on the District of Columbia in any legislation they are going to bring before the House to-day will know the facts.

Mr. ARENTZ. The gentleman has lots of followers, so why not introduce a bill to repeal that bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. I think that would be very desirable.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield for a question?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman said that the time had gone by, but is there not a remedy that we could now apply by appropriate legislation? Have they acquired rights that we could not take away from them?

Mr. CRAMTON. No. If the Congress would pass the legislation, it would still be in time.

Mr. GARNER. Why does not the gentleman introduce the necessary legislation and try to remedy the situation?

Mr. CRAMTON. I will be very pleased to do that and see how far we may get with it.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SOCIETY SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3048) to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society Sons of the American Revolution in Washington, D. C. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the property situated in square 196 in the city of Washington described as lot 10, together with all the furniture and furnishings now in and upon premises 1227 Sixteenth Street NW., occupied by the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, be, and the same is hereby, exempt from and after August 26, 1927, from all taxation so long as the same is so occupied and used, subject to the provisions of section 8 of the act approved March 3, 1877, providing for exemptions of church and school property, and acts amendatory thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out the words "August 26, 1927," and insert "the date of the approval of this act by the President."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if this property is used in any sense for the purpose of raising revenue in behalf of the society?

Mr. McLEOD. I understand it is not.

Mr. HOWARD. Does the gentleman know it is not?

Mr. McLEOD. From the information the committee has, it is not.

Mr. HOWARD. Until the gentleman can tell me positively it is not, I shall have to object.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I am going to suggest an amendment on page 2, after the word "is," to insert the word "exclusively," so as to provide "so long as the same is exclusively so occupied." I think this would cover it, because then it must be exclusively occupied by the Sons of the American Revolution. I have in mind the same thing the gentleman has.

Mr. HOWARD. That would help, but I want to know that no citizen will ever be charged for entry upon these premises.

Mr. McLEOD. The testimony the committee received from the Sons of the American Revolution was that all functions held on these premises, whatever their object might be, were always free and open only to those individuals, and with the amendment suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] I can not see what objection the gentleman could have to the bill.

Mr. HOWARD. I suggest to the gentleman he make the amendment a little stronger. That is not strong enough for me.

Mr. McLEOD. I may say further to the gentleman from Nebraska that this is identical with the bill passed with respect to the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mr. HOWARD. That may be. It is identical with the Masonic and Odd Fellow measures, and I belong to all of them, but I believe in everything paying taxes, where there is any money received from the property. We had better pass it over until the gentleman perfects the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOWARD. I object for the present, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the bill that has just been called up, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD an adverse report of the District Commissioners on this bill, which report has been omitted from the committee report, in order that the Members of the House may be informed of the reasons the Commissioners of the District do not think this bill should be enacted into law.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an adverse report of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on the bill just called up. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., December 23, 1929.

Hon. F. N. ZIEHLMAN,
Chairman Committee on the District of Columbia,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit the following on H. R. 3048, Seventy-first Congress, first session, entitled "A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society Sons of the American Revolution in Washington, D. C.," which you referred to them for consideration and report.

Under existing law property used for educational, charitable, and religious purposes is exempted from taxation if it fulfills certain requirements. This is a general law. Under certain special laws other properties of philanthropic or patriotic character have been exempted. The total exemptions which have been made of property in the District of Columbia for these purposes amounts to \$75,000,000. The commissioners have had other bills referred to them providing for a special law which would increase the present large amount of exempt property. Such laws tend to shift the burden of taxation from the few directly interested to the general public. The commissioners believe it to be a sounder fundamental policy to insist that the founders and members of organizations which are not purely charitable, educational, or religious, and therefore whose property would not be exempt under the present general law, should pay taxes for such property and recognize such an obligation in the founding of their institutions and the calculations of their budgets.

For the reasons given above the commissioners are constrained to recommend adverse action on this bill.

Very truly yours,

PRESIDENT BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

CONSTRUCTION OF PRIVATE AND SEMIPUBLIC BUILDINGS IN CERTAIN AREAS OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2400) to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in certain areas of the National Capital.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in view of the provisions of the Constitution respecting the establishment of the seat of the National Government, the duties it imposed upon Congress in connection therewith, and the solicitude shown and the efforts exerted by President Washington in the planning and development of the Capital City, it is hereby declared that such development should proceed along the lines of good order, good taste, and with due regard to the public interests involved, and a reasonable degree of control should be exercised over the architecture of private or semipublic buildings adjacent to public buildings and grounds of major importance. To this end, hereafter when application is made for permit for the erection or alteration of any building, any portion of which is to front or abut upon the grounds of the Capitol, the grounds of the White House, the portion of Pennsylvania Avenue extending from the Capitol to the White House, Rock Creek Park, the Zoological Park, the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, Potomac Park, the Mall park system and public buildings adjacent thereto, or abutting upon any street bordering any of said grounds or parks, the plans therefor, so far as they relate to height and appearance, color, and texture of the materials of exterior construction, shall be submitted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to the Commission of Fine Arts; and the said commission shall report promptly to said commissioners its recommendations, including such changes, if any, as in its judgment are necessary to prevent reasonably avoidable impairment of the public values belonging to such public building or park; and said commissioners shall take such action as shall, in their judgment, effect reasonable compliance with such recommendation: *Provided*, That if the said Commission of Fine Arts fails to report its approval or disapproval of such plans within 30 days, its approval thereof shall be assumed and a permit may be issued.

SEC. 2. Said Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in consultation with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, as early as practicable after approval of this act, shall prepare plats defining the areas within which application for building permits shall be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for its recommendations.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOG TAXES

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 11403) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a revenue in the

District of Columbia by levying tax upon all dogs therein, to make such dogs personal property, and for other purposes," as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. About a year ago a committee was created to make a study of the licensing laws of the District for the purpose of drafting a bill to replace the law passed in 1902, which is now obsolete in many features. I ask if any progress has been made in the committee with respect to this proposed act.

Mr. McLEOD. I do not believe so. I do not think that has been considered so far this session.

Mr. GIBSON. I will say to the chairman of the committee that the District officials are very much concerned about the situation. In the application of the present law certain activities are subject to exorbitant taxes. I mention this as one of the injustices of the present law. Many activities are charged ridiculously low fees and many are not included by reason of changed conditions.

Mr. McLEOD. The gentleman knows that I am in sympathy with him, and it is the intention of the committee to reach it as soon as possible.

Mr. TARVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think it proper that the membership of the House should be informed as to the nature of this bill, before granting consent. I do not propose myself to enter an objection. This is not a bill of the character you think it is by reading the title. It is a bill to raise the salary of the official dog catcher from about \$2,300 to approximately \$3,000—the exact figures I do not recall. I call your attention also to the fact that the personnel classification board, which has had under consideration the appeal of this official for higher classification has denied the appeal and the District Commissioners have adversely reported on the proposed increase of salary. If no one has an objection I shall enter no formal objection myself, but I felt that you should be acquainted with the facts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act to create a revenue in the District of Columbia by levying a tax upon all dogs therein, to make such dogs personal property, and for other purposes," approved June 19, 1878 (20 Stat. 173), as amended, be, and the same is hereby, amended by inserting, following section 9, a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. In order to carry out properly and effectively the duties imposed upon him by Congress the poundmaster is hereby given authority as a special police officer of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, with authority to make arrests in the performance of his duty, and he shall receive a salary at the rate of \$3,080 per annum."

SEC. 2 Section 10 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. That all acts or parts of acts now in force in the District of Columbia inconsistent with the provisions of this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOR THE DISPOSAL OF COMBUSTIBLE REFUSE FROM PLACES OUTSIDE OF THE CITY OF WASHINGTON

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 9767, for the disposal of combustible refuse from places outside of the city of Washington.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 4221 be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized to enter into agreement with the Board of County Commissioners of Montgomery County, State of Maryland; the Board of County Commissioners of Prince Georges County, State of Maryland; the Board of Supervisors of Arlington County, State of Virginia, and/or with the several municipalities, taxing areas, and communities within the counties aforesaid having power and authority to enter into such agreements, said agreements to permit said counties, municipalities, taxing areas, and communities to dispose of combustible

material in the incinerators built by the District of Columbia under authority of the act approved March 4, 1929, entitled "An act authorizing the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia and the construction thereon of two modern high-temperature incinerators for the destruction of combustible refuse, and for other purposes," in such kind and quantities, at such times, and for such fees as the said Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall specify: *Provided*, That said counties, municipalities, taxing areas, and communities shall make collections of such material with their own equipment and shall obtain permits from the District of Columbia for hauling or transporting the material over routes within the District of Columbia to be designated by the said commissioners. The commissioners shall have the right to suspend or revoke such agreements if found necessary for the proper and successful operation of these incinerators, or for any other reason.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan a question. Does the gentleman believe that the city of Washington is sufficiently protected in not having its streets used for the garbage carts of neighboring municipalities going either way to the District incinerator?

Mr. McLEOD. They are going through streets only designated by the commissioners.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. We have gone through this thing in my own city. The objection is that the garbage wagons must go through the streets of the city to get to the incinerator. If you are going to make a dumping ground for Maryland and Virginia, you ought to go slow and not have all of the garbage drawn through the streets of the city.

Mr. McLEOD. The committee felt that, according to the testimony given, there will be considerable money saved for the District of Columbia. In going through the streets, that matter comes within the jurisdiction of the commissioners, who designate certain streets for the passage of the garbage wagons.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Reducing the cost of garbage disposal and an increase of the stench from garbage wagons going through the streets would be too big a price to pay, but I presume the committee has looked into it.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT TO SETTLE CLAIMS AND SUITS AGAINST THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 9996, an act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia, approved February 11, 1929.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 1 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia," approved February 11, 1929, be, and the same hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"(a) Arises out of the negligence or wrongful act, either of commission or omission, of any officer or employee of the District of Columbia for whose negligence or acts the District of Columbia, if a private individual, would be liable prima facie to respond in damages, irrespective of whether such negligence occurred or such acts were done in the performance of a municipal or a governmental function of said District: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as depriving the District of Columbia of any defense it may have to any suit, either at law or in equity, which may be instituted against it."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "it," insert the following language: "or to give any person, corporation, partnership, or association any right to institute any suit against the District of Columbia which did not exist prior to the passage of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 601, SUBCHAPTER 3, CODE OF LAWS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill 3144, to amend sections 599, 600, and 601 of subchapter 3 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the board of directors bill?

Mr. STOBBS. Yes. I am going to offer an amendment which I think will satisfy the gentleman's objection. I shall provide in the amendment that this shall be applicable only to missionary and religious organizations.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 599, 600, and 601 of subchapter 3 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia be, and the same are hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 599. Certificate: Any three or more persons of full age, citizens of the United States, who desire to associate themselves for benevolent, charitable, educational, literary, musical, scientific, religious, or missionary purposes, including societies formed for mutual improvement or for the purpose of religious worship, may make, sign, and acknowledge, before any officer authorized to take acknowledgment of deeds in the District, and file in the office of the recorder of deeds, to be recorded by him, a certificate in writing, in which shall be stated—

"First. The name or title by which such society shall be known in law.

"Second. The term for which it is organized, which may be perpetual.

"Third. The particular business and objects of the society.

"Fourth. The number of its trustees, directors, or managers for the first year of its existence.

"SEC. 600. Signers incorporated: Upon filing their certificates the persons who shall have signed and acknowledged the same and their associates and successors shall be a body politic and corporate, by the name stated in such certificate; and by that name they and their successors may have and use a common seal, and may alter and change the same at pleasure, and may make by-laws and elect officers and agents, and may take, receive, hold, and convey real and personal estate necessary for the purposes of the society as stated in their certificate: *Provided, however*, That this section shall not be construed to exempt any property from taxation in addition to that now specifically exempted by law.

"SEC. 601. Trustees: Such incorporated society may elect its trustees, directors, or managers at such time and place and in such manner as may be specified in its by-laws, who shall have the control and management of the affairs and funds of the society, and a majority of whom shall be a quorum for the transaction of business, unless a less number be specified as a quorum in the by-laws; and whenever any vacancy shall happen in such board of trustees, directors, or managers the vacancies shall be filled in such manner as shall be provided by the by-laws of the society."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the letter "s" in the word "sections."

Page 1, line 3, strike out "599, 600, and."

Line 4, strike out the word "are" and insert the word "is."

Line 6, strike out all of lines 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, on page 1, and lines 1 to 24, inclusive, on page 2, and lines 1 and 2 on page 3.

Mr. STOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STOBBS: Page 3, line 8, after the word "business," strike out "unless a less number be specified as a quorum in the by-laws," and strike out the period after the word "society," in line 12, and insert the following after the word "society," in line 12: "*Provided*, That any society formed for religious or missionary purposes may provide in its by-laws for a less number than a majority of its trustees to constitute a quorum."

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentleman insert the word "only" after the word "formed," so that it will read "only for religious and missionary purposes."

Mr. STOBBS. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I think it should be made clear that it refers to a society organized only for religious and missionary purposes.

Mr. STOBBS. I accept the suggestion.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I offer that as an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LaGUARDIA to the amendment offered by Mr. STOBBS: After the word "formed" insert the word "only."

The LaGuardia amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. STOBBS was agreed to, and the Stobbs amendment was agreed to. The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 601 of subchapter 3 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia."

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SALE OF DANGEROUS WEAPONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 9641, to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia, to provide penalties, to prescribe rules of evidence, and for other purposes.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What bill is this?

Mr. McLEOD. It is the dangerous weapon bill.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. O Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Chair announced, after inquiring if there was objection, that there was no objection, and it seems to me that the gentleman from New York comes too late with his reservation.

The SPEAKER. Technically, the objection came too late; but if a Member is not familiar with the bill being called up under circumstances like these, the Chair is always disposed to recognize him to object. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, my objection to the bill is that in providing for the issuance of a permit a citizen is required to give a bond for \$500. It seems to me that a citizen getting a permit to protect his personal property or person should not be required to give a bond. Certainly the racketeer and the gangster do not give bonds, and they carry guns. The business man under this legislation would be compelled to obtain a permit to protect his business against such intrusion and, in addition, give a bond.

Mr. COLE. Does the gentleman from New York intend to permit competitive shooting contests?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the gentleman from Iowa think that a bond would prevent such a thing? I think the law-abiding citizen who needs a gun to protect his business should not be compelled to give a bond.

Mr. COLE. Instead of furnishing guns to citizens, would it not be better to take them away from racketeers and gunmen?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Undoubtedly, that would be ideal, but we can not legislate for such a thing. I shall not object to the bill, but I shall offer an amendment at the proper time, and let the House decide.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10651. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Wellsburg, W. Va.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 7955) entitled "An act making appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REED, Mr. JONES, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. GREENE, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. KENDRICK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 12236) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. HOCH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 12236, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12236) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Kansas use some of his time?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRAND] 60 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 60 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in the "Foreword" of one of his books a noted author says:

There is in the nature of every man a longing to see and know the strange places of the world. Life imprisons us all in its coil of circumstance, and the dreams of romance that color boyhood still linger with us as the years pass by. They stir at the sight of a white-sailed ship beating out to the wide sea, the smell of tarred rope on a blackened wharf, or the touch of the cool little breeze that rises when the stars come out will waken them again. Somewhere over the rim of the world lies romance, and every heart yearns to go and find it.

So it is with Members of the American Congress. In looking after the special interests of our constituents, in the discharge of our duties to the country at large and our own States, and particularly in the work of our respective committees, the mind often tires, and it is restful, if not helpful, to let our thoughts now and then roam in other fields and linger on other subjects.

Our duties are so constant and taxing and along entirely different lines, it is now and then a relief to Members to give heed to information upon subject matters to which one has not given a special study and in which the taxpayers of this Republic have a common interest. At least it is so with me, and I take it that all of us, in the main, think and feel alike.

So far as the banking institutions and the business people of the United States are concerned, the country may be divided into two groups:

First, those who collect interest.

Second, those who pay interest.

If this, as a rule, is a sound analysis of the situation, then all classes of people are interested in the Federal reserve system and the proper functioning of the 12 Federal reserve banks, and particularly the payment by the 12 Federal reserve banks of a franchise tax to the Treasury of the United States in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the law.

Section 7 of the Federal reserve act is as follows:

SEC. 7. After all necessary expenses of a Federal reserve bank have been paid or provided for, the stockholders shall be entitled to receive an annual dividend of 6 per cent on the paid-in capital stock, which dividend shall be cumulative. After the aforesaid dividend claims have been fully met, the net earnings shall be paid to the United States as a franchise tax except that the whole of such net earnings, including those for the year ending December 31, 1918, shall be paid into a surplus fund until it shall amount to 100 per cent of the subscribed capital stock of such bank, and that thereafter 10 per cent of such net earnings shall be paid into the surplus.

I may say, in passing, that on May 2, 1930, I introduced a bill (H. R. 12096) which reads as follows:

H. R. 12096, Seventy-first Congress, second session

A bill to amend section 7 of the Federal reserve act

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the Federal reserve act be amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph, and after the word "surplus," in the thirteenth line thereof, a new paragraph to read as follows:

"From the amount of the net earnings which remains to be paid to the United States as franchise tax, as above provided, and before the same is so paid, there shall be paid annually to the member banks of the Federal reserve system a sum equivalent to 2 per cent of their paid-in capital stock."

I want to speak on this bill at some future time. The following statement shows the gross earnings, gross expenses, and the net earnings from 1914 to 1926 of the 12 Federal Reserve Banks. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks by inserting a statement of these amounts in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Following are the tables referred to:

The following statement shows the total gross earnings, expenses, and the net earnings of the 12 banks of the Federal reserve system from 1914 to 1926; and likewise shows the gross earnings, the expenses, and the net earnings of each one of these 12 banks.

From 1914 to 1926

Gross earnings for Federal reserve system	\$678,999,660
Total expenses for Federal reserve system	257,144,956
Net earnings for Federal reserve system	421,854,704
Gross earnings for Federal reserve, Atlanta	31,712,460
Total expenses for Federal reserve, Atlanta	12,526,915
Net earnings for Federal reserve, Atlanta	19,185,545
Gross earnings for Federal reserve, Boston	46,012,482
Total expenses for Federal reserve, Boston	17,291,663
Net earnings for Federal reserve, Boston	28,720,819
Gross earnings for Federal reserve, New York	203,663,709
Total expenses for Federal reserve, New York	60,176,457
Net earnings for Federal reserve, New York	143,487,252
Gross earnings for Federal reserve, Philadelphia	49,378,075
Total expenses for Federal reserve, Philadelphia	18,108,861
Net earnings for Federal reserve, Philadelphia	31,269,214
Gross earnings for Federal reserve, Cleveland	56,243,852
Total expenses for Federal reserve, Cleveland	22,787,558
Net earnings for Federal reserve, Cleveland	33,456,294
Gross earnings for Federal reserve, Richmond	32,966,111
Total expenses for Federal reserve, Richmond	13,250,004
Net earnings for Federal reserve, Richmond	19,716,107
Gross earnings for Federal reserve, Chicago	98,084,253
Total expenses for Federal reserve, Chicago	35,493,609
Net earnings for Federal reserve, Chicago	62,590,644
Gross earnings for Federal reserve, St. Louis	29,019,287

Total expenses for Federal reserve, St. Louis	\$13,812,617
Net earnings for Federal reserve, St. Louis	15,206,670
Gross earnings for Federal reserve, Minneapolis	23,124,687
Total expenses for Federal reserve, Minneapolis	9,688,311
Net earnings for Federal reserve, Minneapolis	13,436,376
Gross earnings for Federal reserve, Kansas City	33,683,079
Total expenses for Federal reserve, Kansas City	16,540,463
Net earnings for Federal reserve, Kansas City	17,142,611
Gross earnings for Federal reserve, Dallas	23,906,756
Total expenses for Federal reserve, Dallas	13,647,708
Net earnings for Federal reserve, Dallas	10,259,048
Gross earnings for Federal reserve, San Francisco	51,191,614
Total expenses for Federal reserve, San Francisco	23,806,490
Net earnings for Federal reserve, San Francisco	27,385,124

In equity and good conscience the net earnings of these banks belong to the taxpayers of the United States, and if the Federal reserve system is ever abolished these net earnings, after paying what is due to the stockholders, should go into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I want first to call your attention to the gross earnings of these Federal reserve banks for these 12 years. They amounted to \$678,999,660. Also to the gross expenses for the same period, which amount to \$257,144,956; and to the net earnings for the period, which amount to \$421,854,704.

Statement showing gross and net earnings of all Federal reserve banks, and disposition made of all earnings, 1914-1929

Years	Gross earnings	Expenses, depreciation, allowances, etc.	Net earnings	Disposition of net earnings			
				Dividends paid	Transferred to surplus	Franchise tax paid to U. S. Government	Profit (+) or loss (-) carried forward
1914-15	\$2,173,282	\$2,314,711	-\$141,459	\$217,463			-\$358,922
1916	5,217,998	2,467,000	2,750,998	1,742,774			+1,008,224
1917	16,128,339	6,548,732	9,579,607	6,801,726	\$1,134,234	\$1,134,234	+509,413
1918	67,584,417	14,868,107	52,716,310	5,540,684	48,334,341		-1,158,715
1919	102,380,583	24,013,979	78,366,604	5,011,832	70,651,778	2,703,894	
1920	181,296,711	32,001,937	149,294,774	5,654,018	82,916,014	60,724,742	
1921	122,865,866	40,778,641	82,087,225	6,119,673	15,993,086	59,974,466	
1922	50,498,099	34,000,963	16,497,136	6,307,035	-659,904	10,850,605	
1923	50,708,596	37,997,280	12,711,316	6,552,717	2,545,513	3,613,055	
1924	38,340,449	34,622,269	3,718,180	6,682,496	-3,077,962	113,646	
1925	41,800,706	32,351,640	9,449,066	6,915,958	2,473,808	59,300	
1926	47,599,595	30,987,850	16,611,745	7,329,169	8,464,426	818,150	
1927	43,024,484	29,976,235	13,048,249	7,754,539	5,044,119	249,591	
1928	64,052,860	31,930,839	32,122,021	8,458,463	21,078,899	2,584,659	
1929	70,955,495	34,552,755	36,402,741	9,583,913	22,535,597	4,283,231	
Total	904,628,021	389,412,038	515,215,983	90,672,460	277,433,949	147,109,574	

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. What items go to make up the total of the gross expenses? What is included?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. That is one reason why I asked for time to make this address. I want Members of Congress who seek information upon this question or who are interested in it to ask themselves that question, and answer how it is possible for these 12 banks for only 12 years—inasmuch as they do not pay any money or receive any checks over the counter, or otherwise carry on an ordinary banking business—could expend \$257,144,956.

The net earnings during this time were \$421,854,704.

I ask your careful attention and study of the figures showing the amount of gross earnings and the gross expenses of the 12 Federal reserve banks during this period. I also want to call your attention to the additional fact—and it is a fact—that for the year 1926 only \$818,150 was paid as franchise tax by the 12 Federal reserve banks. In the year 1927 all that the 12 banks paid was \$249,591.

In the year 1928 all the banks together paid only \$2,584,659. The total amount paid from 1914 to 1929 is \$142,826,343. It is now approximately around \$146,000,000.

But I want to call this to your especial attention: During the years 1927, 1928, and 1929 the New York Federal Reserve Bank, the Boston bank, the Philadelphia bank, the Cleveland bank, and the San Francisco bank did not pay a dollar of franchise tax. During the years 1927 and 1928 the Chicago bank paid nothing. During the year 1927 the St. Louis bank, the Dallas bank, the Atlanta bank, and the Richmond bank paid nothing.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. I confess that I am not well versed in the affairs of the Federal reserve system. Why did these banks not pay a franchise tax?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. They are required to pay it out of their net earnings. Later I shall give you an answer to this question made by Governor Young of the Federal Reserve Board. It was propounded to him by me when he was a witness before the Committee on Banking and Currency when the

committee was having hearings on branch, chain, and group banking.

I quoted these figures to Governor Young, and then propounded this question:

What I want to know is why these banks did not pay any franchise tax during those years?

Governor Young's reply was as follows, and I think it is only fair to him to use his own language:

Governor YOUNG. Solely because of the law. The law permits the accumulation of a surplus 100 per cent of the subscribed capital of a reserve bank. Generally speaking, the banks in those sections increased their capital, thereby increasing their stock subscription to the Federal reserve stock, thereby increasing the possibility of increasing their surplus account.

In the other sections where a franchise tax was paid the profits in previous years were large enough so that they accumulated their surplus account up to 100 per cent of their subscribed capital, with the result that the balance went to the Government.

Mr. BRAND. Is it not strange to you, even in the face of your statement, that during all of the hard and lean years of the country from 1920 on down to 1927, these banks paid millions and millions of dollars of franchise tax into the Treasury and yet these large banks to which I referred during the years 1927, 1928, and 1929, did not pay a cent? Governor YOUNG. Not strange, under the law.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. DUNBAR. Did Governor Young give any indication of the amount of money that was pledged to capitalization which otherwise might have gone into franchise tax?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. No; he did not.

Mr. DUNBAR. That would be an important thing to know. Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I have part of the figures here, but I do not think that that information answers your inquiry or that of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

Mr. DUNBAR. It would be interesting for us to know it.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Then I asked Governor Young this question:

By manipulation of figures and other ways of getting around it, would it not be possible that these banks could reach the point where they would not pay any franchise tax?

Governor YOUNG. Your inquiry is that they can juggle the figures in such a way that they do not have to pay a franchise tax?

Mr. BRAND. Can they do that or something else in such a way as to avoid paying a franchise tax?

Governor YOUNG. My answer is no.

Mr. BRAND. Why do they increase the stock—to keep from paying a franchise tax or for what reason?

Governor YOUNG. When a member bank that has a capital stock of \$50,000 and increases that capital stock to \$100,000, that requires it to subscribe for that much more stock in the Federal reserve bank.

Then the question arises, as suggested by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], and which I am suggesting during this debate, why do these State member banks and national banks of the Federal reserve system increase their capital stock when they do not have to pay in but half of it, and the dividend they get on that is only 3 per cent? I do not think that the last question I propounded to Governor Young was an improper or an intemperate inquiry, when his answer to the former ones was in effect that the failure to pay any franchise tax for the years named by me was and is due to an increase of the capital stock by member banks of the reserve system. If Governor Young's opinion is accurate and sound and if the member banks continue to increase their capital stock purchases, it may be possible to arrive at the point in the near future when the Treasury of the United States will not be paid \$1 of franchise tax from any of these Federal reserve banks. That is to say, if they continue to increase the capital stock. I do not charge it, but I am not so sure but that it was the deliberate purpose on the part of some persons connected with the member banks or the national banks or the Federal reserve banks to adopt this policy of buying new stock and increasing their capital with the result that there would be no franchise tax paid into the Treasury of the United States. I do not say that there is anything criminal in what they have done, or anything illegal, because purchases of this increased capital in the Federal reserve banks are within the limitations of the law.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. It is fair to assume that they do that because it is more profitable to them than to pay a franchise tax, is it not?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. It is fair to assume, in my judgment, that they are more interested in making money and building up a great volume of net earnings and fortunes for themselves, rather than for the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. WRIGHT. Well, it is more profitable for them.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Yes; I think so. As every banker knows, the 12 Federal reserve banks do not pay to member banks any interest, and have never paid any interest, on this reserve account. They get the use of this money without any cost whatever. Member banks of the system are required to keep a reserve there under section 39 of the Federal reserve act, which reads as follows:

Every bank, banking association, or trust company which is, or which becomes, a member of any Federal reserve bank shall establish and maintain reserve balances with its Federal reserve bank as follows:

(a) If not in a reserve or central reserve city, as now or hereinafter defined, it shall hold and maintain with the Federal reserve bank of its district an actual net balance equal to not less than 7 per cent of the aggregate amount of its demand deposits and 3 per cent of its time deposits.

(b) If in a reserve city, as now or hereinafter defined, it shall hold and maintain with the Federal reserve bank of its district an actual net balance equal to not less than 10 per cent of the aggregate amount of its demand deposits and 3 per cent of its time deposits.

In other words, if a member bank not in a reserve or central reserve city has demand deposits of \$250,000, it has to place with the Federal reserve bank 7 per cent of that. If the bank has time deposits amounting to \$100,000, it has to pay 3 per cent of that, and the member bank never gets a cent of this reserve fund by way of interest or otherwise.

In addition to this a State bank, member of the Federal reserve system, has lost its right, lawfully exercised prior to the time the bank became a member of the system, to make any charge for clearing other people's checks. Prior to becoming a member of this system the country bank, in collecting and paying other people's checks, had the right to and did make a reasonable charge for this service, so the member bank not only loses the use of this reserve fund but they have lost a substantial source of income, because they are not permitted to make any exchange charge on payment and collection of checks.

Is it possible that Congress will complacently and passively look favorably upon a situation like this and do nothing which will be more beneficial to the member banks? The Government organized these banks, and when the Federal reserve act was

passed it was in the mind of Congress that they were to annually pay a franchise tax out of their net earnings. They make large annual net earnings, notwithstanding their expense account is very large. They pay the member banks nothing, and the time may arrive when none of the 12 Federal reserve banks will pay the Government anything.

I respectfully insist in this connection that it is a natural question to consider whether this is right and fair to the Treasury of the United States.

If the increase of the capital stock of national banks and State member banks is the reason why no franchise-tax payments were made by these banks during the years I have referred to, the question naturally arises, Why did these banks increase their capital stock?

Why did these banks increase the capital stock for the years 1926, 1927, 1928, and 1929? What is the real reason why these national banks and State member banks during the years increased their capital stock when they were only getting 3 per cent on their paid-in capital stock, based upon the rate of 6 per cent on capital stock subscribed?

If this is the only reason why no franchise tax was paid by these banks into the Treasury of the United States during the years 1926, 1927, 1928, and 1929, is it not highly advisable for Congress to take into consideration the propriety of disallowing member banks, State and national, to make any more subscriptions to the capital stock of the Federal reserve system?

What is to hinder all the national and State member banks of the entire 12 banks of the Federal reserve system from increasing their capital stock and thus depriving entirely the Treasury of the United States from getting any franchise tax?

Which is preferable and the wisest course to pursue and adopt: To refuse to allow the member banks of the Federal reserve system to make any additional subscription of capital stock of these banks and the Treasury therefore receive a substantial payment of the franchise tax per annum, or permit them to continue to subscribe until the point is reached when none of the 12 Federal reserve banks pays anything as a franchise tax? In other words, these 12 Federal reserve banks, by such an increase in the capital stock, on the part of national banks and State member banks, could wipe out entirely or absorb all the franchise tax.

If this situation arises and the law remains as it is, the Treasury of the United States would be benefited in no way by the Federal reserve system. The member banks, unless the law is changed, would be getting no interest or earnings on account of their membership in the Federal reserve system, besides losing the exchange on checks, which would leave the 12 Federal reserve banks in the attitude of absorbing all the profits of the system.

Taking all these things into consideration, and particularly the enormous expense of the 12 Federal reserve banks, makes the same, in my judgment, the most expensive and the most powerful institution in the history of the world.

To this situation I invite the thought and serious consideration of the American Congress, with the hope that the existing evil, if any, of the present banking system of the United States may be remedied.

I particularly insist that the bill which I have introduced, and to which I have already called your attention, should be given prompt and favorable consideration and that this bill should be favorably reported by our committee unless and until some other bill may be considered and favorably acted upon by the committee which will afford to member banks some actual monetary benefit, to which, in my judgment, they are entitled and are not receiving. [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. CRISP. Aside from the fact that a country bank can rediscount its papers with a Federal reserve bank, if they are a member of the banking system, what benefit does the country bank get from joining the Federal reserve system?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. I propounded the same question to Governor Young. In my judgment, such a bank to which my friend refers does not get any benefit except the psychological effect it may have upon people who patronize the bank, as customers, and particularly depositors, and to some extent, the stockholders. Provided, of course, such a bank to which the gentleman refers does not want to borrow any money from them and has no occasion to discount any eligible paper with them, it would not get any benefit.

Now, before I go any further, I want to answer the inquiry of my friend from Indiana [Mr. DUNBAR], who is a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. He is one of the best members of that committee, and there sits another one at his right, my friend Judge LUTTS, who is a very valuable member.

When these two gentlemen became members it increased the average of the Banking and Currency Committee. [Applause.]

I have here a statement showing the increase in the capital stock of the national and State banks for the years 1926, 1927, 1928, and 1929. In 1926 the increase in the capital stock was \$83,357,000, and the Federal reserve bank paid only \$818,150. All of the banks only paid that much that year. In 1927 the increase was \$136,920,000, and they paid \$249,591. In 1928 the increase was \$171,749,500, and they only paid \$2,584,659. In 1929 the increase was \$320,455,125, and these banks paid \$4,283,231. The total of the increase in the capital stock of the State member banks and the national banks was \$711,653,625, and they only paid a franchise tax of \$7,935,631 for those four years.

I have another statement showing the increase of capital stock of the national banks, and the increase of stock of the State member banks of the Federal reserve system. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to insert this statement as a part of my address.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

Number of national banks increasing capital stock during years 1926, 1927, 1928, and 1929

	Amount	Number of banks
1926.....	\$49,440,000	210
1927.....	86,184,000	238
1928.....	131,552,500	268
1929.....	181,730,125	335
Total.....	448,906,625	1,051

Number of State banks, members of the Federal reserve system, increasing capital stock during 1926, 1927, 1928, and 1929

	Amount	Number of banks
1926.....	\$33,917,000	56
1927.....	46,908,000	63
1928.....	40,197,000	72
1929.....	138,725,000	96
Total.....	262,747,000	287

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. It will be a serious question when and if the 12 Federal reserve banks of this country, by the increase of the capital stock of the member banks or otherwise cease to pay to the United States a franchise tax as required by the law which created them.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. DUNBAR. In regard to their not paying anything into the general Treasury, last year they did pay \$2,900,000, or thereabouts, but in former years they paid as much as \$60,000,000 a year. I presume this was before they resorted to the practice to which the gentleman has just referred and to which he objects.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. That is correct. I have been making efforts to obtain the amount of the increased capital stock of State and national banks for the years preceding 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, from the year 1914, and also the amount of franchise tax paid from 1914 to 1926, but have up to the present time failed to obtain the amount of tax paid for these years.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does the gentleman propose to stop these increased subscriptions for Federal reserve stock and make it mandatory that these earnings shall be distributed every year and the franchise tax paid as was the custom some time ago, and to which the gentleman has already referred?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Well, I am in favor of this law being carried out strictly and being construed strictly in reference to the Federal reserve banks, in order that the taxpayers of the United States may get the benefit of the franchise tax as provided by the law.

Mr. BRIGGS. In other words, as I understand it, the gentleman thinks the tax ought to be paid in any event, and whatever appropriation may be necessary ought to be made out of the Federal Treasury?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. No; I do not think any such thing and I have not said anything to indicate that, with all respect to my friend from Texas. I have made no reference to any appropriation being made for any purpose. The gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. BRIGGS. I did not mean to misconstrue what the gentleman has said. I was just trying to interpret what the

gentleman had stated from its impression upon me. I thought the gentleman said he wanted the taxes paid.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Yes; I do.

Mr. BRIGGS. If the tax is paid, it goes into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. And any disposition of that fund would have to be made by the Congress.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. That is already provided for in another section of the act.

Mr. BRIGGS. That has to be made by the Congress.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Of course. That was provided for when the act was passed; but if no franchise tax is paid, that requirement of the law becomes a dead letter.

Mr. BRIGGS. That is the very point I am asking about. The gentleman wants the tax paid and the distribution of it made as the Congress has provided.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Yes; but how can you distribute the franchise tax when there is none to distribute?

Mr. BRIGGS. If you get it paid in, as the gentleman has suggested, then there would be something to distribute.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Exactly; and that is what I am after—to get the franchise tax paid by the 12 Federal reserve banks into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BRIGGS. That is exactly what I understood the gentleman to be contending for.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. That is my position.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. This may be a little apart from the subject the gentleman has been discussing, and yet it pertains to the same subject matter. I am wondering what the gentleman's opinion is, if the gentleman is willing to express it, as to the possibility or the probability with respect to State banks of the States passing a guaranty law which would be workable and safe. Has the gentleman given any thought to that question?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. A guaranty of deposits?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I have given about six years of thought to that question, and I will be pleased to answer the question of the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN. I am asking purely for information.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. There are bills lying in the Banking and Currency Committee, introduced by two or three members of the committee, providing for some safety to depositors of insolvent banks, one of which I introduced six years ago, providing that there should be established what is known in my bill as a guaranty deposit fund, and also providing when a bank becomes insolvent that the depositors—no other creditors of a failed bank—but that the depositors should first be paid out of this guaranty fund. The bill further provides this franchise tax which we have been discussing and which now amounts to approximately \$146,000,000 should constitute this guaranty deposit fund.

Mr. GREEN. And in that case, if that plan is found workable, the States could enact similar laws.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman, as I understand it, has introduced a bill dealing with this subject matter which is now pending before the committee of which he is a member.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. Would the gentleman give us a more extended discussion of the provisions of his bill and inform us whether or not he thinks favorable action is likely to be taken by the committee?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I will be pleased to answer that question so far as I can. Governor Young was on the stand before our committee for about four weeks, and Mr. Pole, the Comptroller of the Currency, for about five weeks, and they both expressed the thought that there ought to be some additional help or benefit provided by the Congress to the member banks of the Federal reserve system. They both thought it advisable that something more should be done for the member banks of the Federal reserve system than is being done now.

However, neither one of them was then ready to propose any legislation as to how this benefit should be made effective, but they agreed to take this phase of the banking situation under consideration and submit later on their recommendations to our committee.

In the meantime, it occurred to me that a very easy way to solve one of the evils for the present, at least, was to amend section 7 of the Federal reserve act, providing that out of the net earnings which remained to be paid to the United States as a franchise tax as provided by section 7 and before it is paid, to

pay annually to the member banks of the system an amount equivalent of 2 per cent of their paid-in capital stock.

In other words, the effect of my bill would be instead of the member banks getting 6 per cent per annum on their capital stock when it is all paid in, they would get 8 per cent per annum; an increase of 2 per cent on their paid-in capital stock.

I asked two high-class expert bankers from California who appeared before our committee as witnesses recently what they thought about my bill. I refer to A. P. Giannini and J. A. Bacigalupi. They replied in substance that it was a good bill and ought to pass. Their banking institution is one of the greatest and most successful in this country. I am referring to this Italian bank in California.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is an American bank.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Yes; it is an American bank run by very high-class men personally and officially, though they are Italian, as I am informed. They are making money, and they both believe that you ought to have State-wide branch banking, United States branch banking, and world-wide branch banking.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does the gentleman believe in that?

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. No.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Neither do I.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Further answering the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TAYLOR], since my bill was introduced I have gotten dozens of letters from people who approve of it. Many Members of Congress have expressed to me their hearty approval of such a bill. I have no doubt but that this bill or a similar one in character will receive at the hands of our committee favorable consideration, though I have no desire or right to speak for any of them.

I do not think the 12 Federal reserve banks or any of them—and I do not care where they are located, whether in Georgia or New York, should adopt a policy or continue in force a policy, though within the limitations of the law, which will permit them to evade the payment of the franchise tax into the Treasury of the United States in accordance with the spirit and letter of the law of the land. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to insert therein certain tables with reference to the London naval agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, for the last seven years it has been my privilege to serve upon the Naval Appropriations Committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH]. During that time I have watched him growing steadily in the esteem and confidence of the Members of the House, as he deserves, in view of the great time and sincere devotion that he has put into his work.

In view of the confused attitude of some of the Members of the House and of the press with reference to the London naval treaty, which is now before the Senate for ratification, I feel it incumbent upon me as one who has given a great deal of time and attention in the last seven years to the Navy and naval affairs to express my views upon it.

America was represented at that conference by the ablest group of men the President could gather together. With a delegation headed by the Secretary of State, Mr. Stimson, and supported by such men as Secretary of the Navy Adams, Ambassador Dawes, Ambassador Morrow, Ambassador Gibson, Senator REED, Senator ROBINSON of Arkansas, and supported and advised by such men as Admiral Pratt, who is to be the next Chief of the Bureau of Operations, and who is generally regarded as the leading authority amongst men in active service in the Navy, and Admiral Yarnell, Chief of the Bureau of Engineering, and Admiral Moffett, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, are we going to believe for a moment that America deliberately entered into a treaty in which her rights were not entirely protected? It has been said that the carrying out of this treaty requires the United States to enter into an expenditure of a billion dollars for ships and aircraft between now and 1936. The actual facts are that the only limit as to the construction of any type of craft which was extended beyond present limits fixed by the Washington treaty and by construction limits authorized by Congress was the light-cruiser type of craft. The light-cruiser type of craft was increased a total of 23,000 tons. The battleship type was reduced by 69,000 tons.

It is true that we will have to do a very considerable amount of building to bring our aircraft tonnage up to that of Great Britain and up to the limit allowed us under the Washington treaty; but that is not a new situation created by the treaty; it is one which already existed.

It is true also that we will have to build a certain amount of destroyer tonnage due to the prospective wearing out of some of our destroyers, and that is not a new situation but one which would have come in any event.

With reference to battleships, it is a fair thing to say that the construction of no new ones prior to 1936 is assured. Because of the tremendous cost—I believe \$40,000,000 apiece is a minimum estimate—the nations of the world are unwilling to embark into construction of such ships unless it is absolutely necessary. By that time naval experts will have reached the stage where they are more unanimously of the opinion, one way or the other, as to whether or not any more should be built. In the meantime the question of whether airplanes will fulfill their purpose will be pretty well worked out as a result of airplane development and the maneuvers of the fleet. Unquestionably the number of battleships, in my opinion, as a result of this treaty has been permanently reduced to 15. Whether it can go lower or not depends on future conferences.

AIRCRAFT CARRIERS

One conspicuous advantage of the treaty is that as much as 25 per cent of the total tonnage in cruisers can be built with landing and taking-off decks, provided the ship does not come within the definition of what is exclusively an aircraft carrier. This will undoubtedly enable us to meet our situation satisfactorily from the standpoint of national defense. I believe a cruiser capable of carrying 25 or 30 planes and capable of making, as is hoped, nearly 40 knots, with 6-inch guns, will be a most important and most effective part of our fleet—certainly our naval experts must have thought so when they consented to this portion of the treaty.

Our cruiser tonnage should be built—that is, the 73,500 tons of it which is not now authorized—in such a manner that we can best take care of our needs and the needs of our country from the standpoint of national defense. It should not be built hurriedly nor without sufficient time for development of the best possible types of cruisers.

Parity in tonnage alone is not my idea of a navy.

The best possible design available is the thing to aim at; and, if that is done in a conservative and careful manner, I do not believe an enormous program will be necessary. We should not build to exceed four or five before 1936.

With reference to the construction of new aircraft carriers, Great Britain at the present time has 115,000 tons built and building. I doubt if some of their aircraft carriers are as good as ours. They are all old reconstructed ships which date back at least as far as 1918, and some of them as far back as 1913. If we have a tonnage to match hers we undoubtedly will be going as far as good judgment would dictate. If the other powers do not see fit to build up to their tonnage limits, there is no reason why we should.

The light-cruiser type of craft was increased a total of 23,000 tons. The battleship type was reduced 69,000 tons, and instead of coming to a parity in battleships with Great Britain in 1936 or 1937, or possibly 1940, within 18 months after the coming into effect of this treaty and its ratification, the United States will be on a parity in tonnage with Great Britain. Not only that, but I believe she will be on a parity in actual ships in service.

Our cruiser tonnage should be built in order. We are going to have an opportunity to build 73,500 tons of the 6-inch gun light cruisers under the provisions of this treaty, provided we use up all of our allotted 180,000 tons of 8-inch gun cruisers. Then we will have 143,500 tons, which we can have of the 6-inch gun cruisers. We already have 70,500 tons, and this will let us build 73,000 tons more. This 73,000 is a new item, and as against the 73,000 tons we have to leave out 50,000 tons of 8-inch gun cruisers, which already are now authorized by Congress, which will not be built. That is the third bloc of five 10,000-ton cruisers. So that the net increase in light cruisers above what is now authorized is just 23,000 tons. We should build these light cruisers in order. We should build one, and perhaps two, with all of the latest developments, with a deck on which planes may land and from which planes may take off, with all of the latest antiaircraft development, all of the latest gunfire development, and we should see how they work out with the fleet before we go along too fast. My idea of a navy is a navy for national defense and not a navy for tonnage. I do not believe that we should rush helter-skelter into a scheme to build a great lot of tonnage. I believe we should plan our construction so that we can take advantage of the most recent and best development, and we should build ships which would be the superior of anything else afloat in their line when we build them. We might better be two or three years longer building those light cruisers, we might better be five years

longer building them than to build ships that we will not want. We have got to feel our way, because we are going to embark in a new line of enterprise.

DESTROYERS

We undoubtedly will need to keep the standard of our destroyers up to date and to build a few destroyers and destroyer leaders between now and 1936; not a large number but a few of the experimental type. A great many of our destroyers have never been used enough to wear them out and are in condition to last for 10 years and probably if we should build 30,000 tons in the five years between now and 1936 we would have gone as far as the other nations will go in the line of replacement and would still have at that date 150,000 tons of good, serviceable ships.

SUBMARINES

We undoubtedly will not need to build anything like 42,000 tons of submarines by 1936. We should undoubtedly continue our program and try to develop the very best possible type of submarine. Our submarines now are in good shape and we have as good submarines, we are told, as any of the other powers. Of submarines coming into commission since 1920 we have at least 30,000 tons and we now have building 5,000 tons.

The treaty altogether is going to place a definite limit against which we and other countries can construct. It is going to require us to scrap no ships which would not be scrapped in any event because of age and will save us hundreds of millions of dollars in maintenance and operations and tremendous amounts in new construction without in any way impairing our national defense.

It will require Britain either to cut out all 8-inch-gun ships on her building program or to scrap approximately 60,000 tons of large new ships. It will also require her to reduce her tonnage in the smaller ships by about the amount of ships that will be obsolete by age by 1936.

All in all, the treaty is one which should command and should have the support of every American.

It adequately takes care of our national defense and at the same time results in tremendous financial saving, besides being a great step forward in the limitation of armaments and toward the peace of the world.

Mr. DUNBAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. DUNBAR. The gentleman said that we should keep our destroyers up to date. Our present tonnage of destroyers is 290,000. The tonnage permissible under the London Conference is 150,000, or a deduction of 140,000 tons. I am wondering if Great Britain and Japan propose to reduce their destroyers in the same proportion.

Mr. TABER. The total of tonnage which the United States has now of destroyers is deceiving. At the present time we have approximately 284,000 tons of destroyers. Of those 61, or approximately 75,000 tons, and that is a rough figure, are completely obsolete and on the disposal list, due to the giving out of machinery. Almost all of our ships go back to 1920. We have four or five which we have built since. However, 150 of these ships have not been in commission more than a year or two, and they have not worn out as ships would which were in constant service; so that instead of having a 16-year life from the date they were completed, those ships would last from 5 to 6 to 7 years beyond the expectation. The reason I said that we should build a destroyer or two, here and there, or a destroyer leader, is that we have no destroyer leaders. That is a ship of something like 2,000 tons.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If I understand it correctly, the members of the Appropriations Committee have tried to hold down the total amount of appropriations in view of this treaty in London?

Mr. TABER. We have not made any specific reductions except one, from the estimates that were submitted to us, because of the treaty.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What is the total of this bill?

Mr. TABER. Approximately \$377,000,000, a reduction from the Budget, where we found we could save without hurting the service, of approximately \$1,300,000, and a reduction of \$400,000, which was made because of an item which was submitted for the laying down of the third bloc of five 10,000-ton 8-inch gun cruisers. Those five cruisers we are not permitted to build under the treaty which has been submitted to the Senate. Our committee thought it would be good faith for us to strike that item from the bill. Otherwise we have left the bill in such shape that everything else will go along in just the same shape that it is now, and we have set forth in our report a request to the administration, in the event of the ratification of the treaty and an ability, before the fiscal year 1931 is complete,

to save any money by reason of personnel or by reason of expenditures for the upkeep of ships, that should be saved for the Treasury and not spent in other places, unless there is an emergency which appeals to the President.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I understand there is a good deal of agitation in the newspapers and controversy among Members of Congress, between those favoring a big Navy and those in favor of cutting the Navy. I have always been in favor of an adequate Navy. But it strikes me—and does it not strike you?—that more than \$377,000,000 on a peace basis, with all this unemployment throughout the country, is a heavy appropriation to be carried in this bill?

Mr. TABER. We have cut down every item that we thought could be cut down in good faith to the country, having in mind an adequate defense.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Under this bill how much do you save below what was in the bill heretofore?

Mr. TABER. It will run from \$12,000,000 to \$13,000,000 above that of last year.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Why do we appropriate more money?

Mr. TABER. Because of the increased demands upon us for construction of the 10,000-ton 8-inch gun cruisers that Congress authorized two years ago. Those cruisers have been authorized. Five of them have already been laid down, two of them will be laid down as soon as the discussion for the ratification of this treaty is over, and the country has demanded that we go ahead and appropriate money for the construction of those cruisers. That is the only reason. Ten of them are finally to be built.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thought the gentleman was going to explain to the House what saving, if any, we would make by carrying out the naval treaty.

Mr. TABER. I have not covered that. It would be more or less a duplication of what the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] covered on Friday. But if the treaty goes into effect it would wipe out practically, six months hence, when it became effective, three battleships. They are each manned by more than a thousand men and more than 70 officers each. Right there will be a saving annually in the personnel and upkeep of each of these ships, in my opinion, of \$2,500,000. Seven million five hundred thousand dollars a year for five years, or \$37,500,000 that we are going to save. That is just one item.

Outside of that we avoid having laid down for new construction battleships to take their place, perhaps two, perhaps three, but, anyway, costing \$80,000,000, in my opinion. I know the Navy Department estimates them at \$35,000,000 apiece.

On top of that we cut out the appropriation for four or five additional battleships between now and 1936 which would have to have been started in order to maintain parity with the other countries. That would run somewhere around \$200,000,000 more. There is one block of saving, running close to \$317,500,000.

On top of that, instead of having a competitive race all the way down the line with the other powers in the construction of cruisers, there is a limit beyond which we may not build and beyond which other nations may not build.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I notice in the Hearst newspapers that some naval officer—it struck me with peculiar force—is criticizing the naval conference through these papers on the front page and is setting forth the idea that as compared with Japan we have the worst of it and are going to destroy more ships in comparison with Japan than we should. Can the gentleman clear that up? I was wondering why the naval officer was doing this.

Mr. TABER. The United States scrapped three ships, all old ships. Great Britain scrapped five big battleships, Japan scrapped one. That undoubtedly was a concession to Japan. But, nevertheless, after we are through with it our battleships will rate at least 10 to 7, or practically 3 to 2, as compared with Japan.

Now, there is no question but that in order to work out an agreement a concession was made to Japan beyond the total percentage of tonnage which was allowed at first under the Washington treaty. But our old ships and Britain's old ships were not as good as the one which Japan is letting out.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I want to ask the gentleman if any of these battleships would ever be able to cross the ocean and engage in a naval battle?

Mr. TABER. I think it is very doubtful that we would ever be called upon to do it. I think they are more valuable for defense than for offense.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. More valuable if we kept them at home?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. There is one other question I would like to ask the gentleman, and that is this: Did your committee ever take into consideration the appropriating of money for the 10-inch guns for the 10,000-ton cruisers, and that another country has a 10,000-ton cruiser that will shoot 3 miles farther than the new ships that we construct? In the event we constructed these new ships we would be outranged, and a few of such ships of other nations could destroy all ours.

Mr. TABER. I question whether any other country having a 10,000-ton ship could shoot 3 miles farther than ours.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I refer especially to Germany, with her new type of cruiser and new gun.

Mr. TABER. It is equipped with a lot of things different from ours. Our naval experts do not agree that their construction is of a superior type. I am frank to say, in view of the absence of the completion of that ship and its demonstration, I am not in a position to pass very effectively upon the efficiency of that ship.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I raised the question because I wondered if there was any information that could be given at the present time in comparing the two types of ships?

Mr. TABER. Not satisfactorily. It is equipped with Diesel engines and some of our experts say that they can not build any ship with those engines which will stand up for a long period of cruising. As to whether or not that is true I am not enough of an expert to say.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As I understand the gentleman, then, to satisfy Japan we had to give Japan something to which under the ordinary rules she would not have been entitled. Is that true?

Mr. TABER. No. We and other countries were proposing a reduction. A reduction was accomplished, and in order to get an agreement it is evident that there was some slight concession as to percentage given to Japan.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does the gentleman understand that we are going to have some further negotiations with Italy and France?

Mr. TABER. I would question if there would be any immediate negotiations.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If we get into negotiations with Italy and France, we will have to give them even greater concessions than we gave Japan, in their present frame of mind. Is that not true?

Mr. TABER. At the present time France has three 10,000-ton 8-inch-gun cruisers built and three building; one appropriated for and not constructed. Italy has two built and four building. At the present time whether they have one or two more is not a very serious matter, as far as we are concerned.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Is it not true that in the wake of every naval conference there is a great deal of misinformation sent throughout the country to create a panicky state of mind as if we were getting the worst of it, and is it not also true that the result of an investigation has shown that some of these naval experts who were then talking were in the pay of shipyards?

Mr. TABER. I am not informed about that. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] does not mean naval officers?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Oh, no.

Mr. TABER. I think it is true, as far as naval experts go. That is true.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Did the United States get the worst of the bargain in the conference which was held in Washington, led by Mr. Hughes?

Mr. TABER. We did not.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I had always understood we did.

Mr. TABER. That came from people who had not balanced up all the factors.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DUNBAR. In the gentleman's estimate he gave us a figure of \$400,000,000?

Mr. TABER. I do not think I got quite that far. I said \$317,500,000.

Mr. DUNBAR. \$317,500,000 as the possible amount of saving if we lived in accord with the proposed London treaty?

Mr. TABER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not give that as the figure. I gave that as some of the items of saving. I think the savings can very readily go beyond that.

Mr. DUNBAR. That is the point I wanted to obtain information upon. I have been informed that if the London Naval Conference treaty is made effective, our savings would be approximately \$1,000,000,000 in six years.

Mr. TABER. Several factors have to be considered. Many of them are problematical. That is, they are things which may or may not have come about. For instance, if we did not have the treaty, we might build immediately, in a couple of years, the last block of 10,000-ton, 8-inch-gun cruisers.

Their construction might have been slow. In addition to those, if the countries across the water, and I mean on both sides of us, had gone on with large construction programs, it is possible that we might have felt it was necessary for us to go on with much larger programs than we now have authorized. It is possible for us to imagine that the construction of the ships that might be built without this treaty would go to almost any figure. No one is smart enough to tell just how much money we can save. There are some things that can be saved and might be saved, and almost any figure can be imagined when such things as that are talked of.

Mr. DUNBAR. A short time ago a question was raised as to why we were going to appropriate so much money for the building of additional cruisers in view of the fact that the expectancy was that we would reduce the number of cruisers. I take it that the reason is we are following our program which was instituted several years ago of getting on a parity with England, and in accord with that idea, we are continuing to appropriate money for the building of cruisers, except that in order to show our good faith to the London conference, we are eliminating \$400,000 from the appropriation cost of laying down of new cruisers this year. We have done that in good faith?

Mr. TABER. That is the situation. Also I may say our committee did not feel that it would be right or fair to the Congress to come here with a bill based entirely upon a treaty which had not yet been ratified, and take into consideration savings which the President might be able to make after the ratification of the treaty, but which he might not be able to make.

For instance, of those three battleships none of them are required under the treaty to be scrapped until 12 months after the ratification of the treaty. Now, I do not believe the President will be 12 months in doing it, but inasmuch as the President has that length of time in which to scrap them, it would not be up to us, without having proper estimates and without being able to handle the situation just as we ought to, to make cuts until the treaty was ratified and we could make definite plans as to the date of taking them out.

Mr. DUNBAR. I notice that under the present tonnage and the one proposed by the London conference, our total tonnage will be reduced from 1,286,436 tons to 1,114,700 tons. That is an approximate reduction of 10 per cent, and in the years to come, if this treaty is made effective, the amount of saving in the operation of our Navy will be quite a considerable amount of money, and, in addition to that, if an agreement can be further made, we may possibly be able to reduce it more; on the other hand, if Italy would begin to build ships so as to be on a parity with France, then France would begin to build ships so as to be on a parity with England; then that might force us to build additional ships to be on a parity with England, so that the future is somewhat uncertain, with the exception that the probabilities are that the amount of tonnage in our Navy will be reduced as suggested by the London conference.

Mr. TABER. That is true.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. In view of the fact that we are to scrap two or three battleships and there has been a controversy over the ability of bombing craft to sink a battleship, in the interest of economy why would it not be a good plan to have another demonstration off the Virginia Capes, and inasmuch as the gentleman is a member of the Appropriations Committee, does he not think it would be a good idea to write a little section in the bill which would cause one of these ships to be set aside and have a little friendly controversy over it between the Army and Navy aviators, in order to see whether or not it could be sunk from the air?

Mr. TABER. The treaty expressly provides that the ships which are to be scrapped may be used as targets. Personally, I should urge that all available targets of that character be taken advantage of.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. In view of the fact that we have to pay out a certain amount of money for the purpose of scrapping and possibly pay out more money than the salvage would bring in to us, and such an exhibition or demonstration would be interesting not only to the Congress but to the country.

try. I am hoping that the committees which have jurisdiction will arrange for the holding of some such contest or some such demonstration as this.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is a member of the Naval Affairs Committee and I am sure his influence as a member of that committee would be very potent with the department in bringing about that test.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am so much in the minority that I have to go to some other committee when I want something accomplished in the interest of efficiency, and that is the reason I am appealing to the gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If the gentleman has in mind simulating war conditions, of course, that might be impossible, because when you undertake to sink a ship that is not provided with any aircraft to defend her, nor with any antiaircraft guns to protect her, it makes a very different proposition from sinking a ship that is provided with defense.

Mr. TABER. That is true.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I assume the lesson which the gentleman seeks to draw from such a test is what effect shells falling on a ship will have and, of course, that is largely the only lesson you can learn by using a battleship as a target where there are no means of defending the ship from the air.

Mr. TABER. There might be this also: You can tell from what height a shell should be dropped or in what manner it should be dropped to get the best results. However, I do not think these old ships are as efficiently protected against aircraft attack as the most modern ships are.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It is very well to call attention to that, but, further, the aircraft might fly with absolute safety against a ship that was unprotected, whereas they might be in very dangerous territory when a ship was properly protected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 20 additional minutes.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will permit, I want to say I agree with the gentleman from Alabama as to the different status that would exist in war time and in peace time with respect to the effect of a bomb dropped from a plane, but we must realize that each one of these battleships carries about 1,000 men and two or three hundred officers, and in a sense most of them are under the water. Therefore it could be compared to a prison ship, because the men are confined there and they can not get out. So if we have these demonstrations we know whether or not there is a possibility of sending that many men and officers to a watery grave by the effect of one of these explosive bombs.

Mr. TABER. That, of course, is true.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I understood the gentleman a while ago to strike a very interesting question when he expressed his opinion that capital ships for naval warfare purposes are of very doubtful value.

Mr. TABER. I do not know that I expressed that as my opinion. I stated there were two views, one of which was that airplanes and carriers were the only safe method of defense, and the other is that you must have the battleship. I do not know that I expressed my opinion, but I did say there was very much of a moot question.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. What did the gentleman find from his study—and I know he has given very thoughtful study to the subject—as to the drift of opinion among well-informed people on that question?

Mr. TABER. The drift of opinion is that aircraft are regarded as of more and more importance day by day.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The question is a very important one from the point of view of saving, for the reason, as the gentleman suggested a while ago, that it costs approximately \$40,000,000 to construct a capital ship.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. More than that now.

Mr. TABER. The Navy Department estimates \$35,000,000 and I said \$40,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. And, in addition, we have the maintenance of our capital-ship fleet at this time, which involves an annual expenditure of about \$40,000,000.

Mr. TABER. Oh, I would say more than that.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Two million five hundred thousand dollars per ship.

Mr. TABER. And eighteen times \$2,500,000.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I have made some inquiry as to the cost of keeping up our battleships and I have been informed by a member of the gentleman's committee, who had also investigated this subject, that the cost is a little over \$40,000,000 a year.

Mr. TABER. I would figure the personnel and operating cost at close to \$2,500,000 per ship.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Has the gentleman any figures with respect to the upkeep of the aircraft carriers?

Mr. TABER. The upkeep of the large aircraft carriers is beyond that of the battleships by a very substantial amount. I hope when the new aircraft carriers, one of which is under construction, are completed we will be able to save something on the tremendous cost of upkeep, which goes with the *Lexington* and the *Saratoga*. They require a very large number of men to man them and consume a tremendous quantity of fuel for the service they are able to perform.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I am in hearty accord with the opinion expressed by the gentleman, because the first two aircraft carriers were more or less experimental.

Mr. TABER. Very much so.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. And we have learned that we do not need ships so large, and that we do not need ships that require 1,800 men and officers aboard them.

Mr. TABER. Oh, if the gentleman will pardon me, 1,900 men and 150 officers.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for the correction.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRIGGS. This bill provides appropriations for how many 8-inch cruisers?

Mr. TABER. Well, we have under construction six of the first block of eight, five of the first block of five, and this bill provides for the commencement of work on two of the second block of five, which would be 13.

Mr. BRIGGS. In other words, there are 18 in contemplation of construction at this time?

Mr. TABER. We have two already built and we have three more which we are not to lay down until 1933, 1934, and 1935, under the treaty.

Mr. BRIGGS. I mean assuming the treaty was not in existence, you would be carrying on construction for 18 and you would have additional authority for 5 more, or a total of 23 cruisers?

Mr. TABER. The Congress has authorized five more than the treaty will permit us to build.

Mr. BRIGGS. In other words, 23 cruisers.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. The treaty contemplates, as I understand it, a change in the character of cruiser tonnage by stipulating an increased amount of 6-inch cruiser instead of 8-inch cruiser tonnage; is not that true?

Mr. TABER. It permits 73,500 tons of 6-inch cruiser tonnage that we have not already constructed or authorized; yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. How many 6-inch cruisers will that provide?

Mr. TABER. It is up to the designers in the Navy Department and the Chief of Operations and other ranking officers to tell us how many they think we should have. I would not be so bold at the present time as to undertake to figure it out.

Mr. BRIGGS. About 10, approximately?

Mr. TABER. I should say 9 or 10 or perhaps, more likely, 8.

Mr. BRIGGS. Based upon the present 7,500-ton cruiser—

Mr. TABER. On that basis it would be 10. I understand they would probably go a little larger because if we are to take advantage of the flying deck we would want to have them close to 10,000 tons.

Mr. BRIGGS. The press has been filled with statements asserting that the 6-inch cruiser is practically valueless at this time to the United States; that we have enough 6-inch cruisers and we ought to have 8-inch cruisers, and that it is a useless expenditure of money to contemplate construction of any more 6-inch cruisers. What does the gentleman have to say about that? I think the Congress is very much interested in knowing the impression of the members of this committee who have gone into this question.

Mr. TABER. Of course, the committee has not had naval experts before it and any opinion we may have on this particular question would be that which we have drawn from our experience in past years. As I stated earlier in my remarks, the treaty provides that not to exceed 25 per cent of our total cruiser tonnage may have these landing and taking-off decks for airplanes. I am assuming, in view of the fact that our representatives entered into the treaty, that they believe a 6-inch gun cruiser with the landing and taking-off deck and the higher speed that will result—and they are built to carry a substantial number of planes and to travel at, perhaps, 40 miles an hour—would, perhaps, offset the advantage of more 8-inch-gun cruisers, especially in view of the fact that no other country will have as many 8-inch-gun cruisers as we will have.

That is my assumption based on the results of the conference—the fact that the ablest men in the Navy, as I believe, were the advisers to the delegates.

Mr. DUNBAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DUNBAR. On page 4 there is a table that I do not understand. It says:

As to ships, the data show as between the 1930 and 1931 plans the following differences:

1930, light cruisers, 8-inch guns.....	5
1931, light cruisers, 8-inch guns.....	8

Does that mean that, in accord with the program under the London conference, our 8-inch cruisers in 1931 will be increased from 1930?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and this table refers to the operations of the fleet. We are building 8-inch-gun cruisers all the time. Of course, they come into commission. We have a group of old cruisers that are nearly 30 years old—the *Rochester*, the *Pittsburgh*, the *Denver*, and others that will gradually go out of commission—that have been used in Central and South American service. Of course, the cruisers of the second line will go out of commission.

Mr. DUNBAR. Then as the years go on, in accordance with the London treaty, will the number of our cruisers be reduced?

Mr. TABER. I can not see any possibility of the number of our cruisers being reduced in the next 10 years without a further treaty.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course, the strength of our Navy is measured by comparison with the other navies of the world?

Mr. TABER. Absolutely.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The mere fact that we are not building does not decrease the strength of our Navy because other countries have agreed also not to build.

Mr. TABER. Great Britain has agreed to keep only fifteen 8-inch-gun cruisers against our 18.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. So the comparative strength of our Navy is the same?

Mr. TABER. I think you might say that as we build the larger number every year, and put in commission 8-inch-gun cruisers, than other countries are building under the treaty the strength of our Navy becomes greater.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It has been sought to create the impression in this country that our Navy is being weakened by the recent treaty. There is no justification for that?

Mr. TABER. Absolutely none. As a matter of fact, under this treaty while Great Britain is obliged to stand still we will increase. For instance, Britain is allowed under the treaty 146,800 tons of 8-inch-gun cruisers. We are allowed 180,000 tons of 8-inch-gun cruisers. Britain now has built and building 205,800 tons of 8-inch-gun cruisers. She has got to scrap down to 146,000 tons, while we, in order to get our 180,000, have got to put in commission in addition to what is now in commission 160,000 tons.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. And in the absence of any agreement we would continue to build up to England and England would build up to Japan, and, after all, our relative strength would be exactly as before.

Mr. TABER. Yes; whereas under the treaty, as far as cruisers are concerned, we will be absolutely on a parity.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Why is the difference between 140,000 tons for Great Britain and 180,000 tons for the United States?

Mr. TABER. Because Britain is allowed 192,000 tons of 6-inch-gun cruisers and the United States only 143,500 tons.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. How many tons of cruisers have we got to build to come up to parity with Great Britain?

Mr. TABER. I am going to answer the questions with reference to the treaty limits which are provided for in the 1936 rather than the present British tonnage. In order to come up to parity we have to complete 160,000 tons of 8-inch-gun cruisers, some of which will be completed in the current calendar year, and 73,500 tons of 6-inch-gun cruisers.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. How much of that is authorized?

Mr. TABER. All except 73,000 tons of 6-inch-gun cruisers.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Does the gentleman mean to say we have authorization to bring us to parity on 8-inch-gun cruisers in 1936?

Mr. TABER. More. We have five more authorized than we are allowed to build under the treaty.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. So that it will be a question whether we are prepared or willing to appropriate within the authorization in the meantime to bring us up to a parity in 1936?

Mr. TABER. We have already appropriated for a very substantial proportion of the 160,000 tons.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. How much?

Mr. TABER. We have already appropriated, or will have when this bill is completed, for the commencement on construction of 130,000 tons out of the 160,000 tons. There will still be left of the 160,000 tons appropriations to be made for 30,000 tons.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. That is to be appropriated?

Mr. TABER. To be appropriated for. That means ships that we have not made any appropriations for.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Then, to bring us up to parity by 1936, we will have to appropriate for 30,000 tons of 8-inch-gun cruisers and a little over 70,000 tons of 6-inch-gun cruisers.

Mr. TABER. If we are going to be at absolute parity at that time. The method of our appropriation must be determined upon how fast we want to go on 6-inch-gun cruisers, and that depends entirely upon the development and the way our naval engineers and constructors work out a successful ship, which will be of the greatest value to the United States for the purpose of our national defense, and on the length of time it will take to work it out.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I suppose what I shall ask now is a fair question to put to the gentleman, if he is prepared to answer it. It is whether in his judgment we should not begin at once with a program to bring us up to absolute parity by 1936? Should we not develop a program and stick to it?

Mr. TABER. I think when the treaty is ratified that we should have authorized a program which permits this country to build up. As to just how fast we ought to build I would not want to say or commit myself until the situation develops year by year, for this reason: Suppose the department got out a type of ship, and the first one was not satisfactory. I would hate to have eight or nine ships built of a type that was not going to be advisable or useful to the Navy. I would like to move along so that we can sort of feel our way, and when we get through we would have something that counts, and not have something that we have to discard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may have 10 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Lest the question of my colleague from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT], who is an expert in matters of national defense, may create a false impression, we are appropriating now for the current year in this bill, for the Naval Establishment, some \$377,000,000, are we not?

Mr. TABER. Yes; including \$50,000,000 for new construction.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The question is being acutely discussed in the minds of a great many to-day whether parity means parity. In other words, whether parity entails an implied obligation upon the part of the United States to build up to a parity or whether it is a mere privilege. What in the gentleman's judgment should be the policy and practice of our country between now and 1936—to go right along building ship by ship and gun by gun, using that as an expression, with Great Britain, or simply to assume that that is a privilege which we may or may not live up to.

Mr. TABER. I think it is a privilege that the people of the United States should determine in each case as they step along whether they want to exercise it or not. I call the attention of the committee to this situation with reference to our aircraft carriers that I have already alluded to. We have something like 90,000 tons built and building. We have the privilege of building something like 60,000 more. Britain has 115,000 tons out of an authorized total of 135,000 tons. I do not think it is necessary for us to build aircraft carriers in tonnage beyond those that Great Britain has. Just because under the treaty we are permitted to build a certain number, I do not think it is necessary for us to build them except for the purpose of national defense. If we are going to have just as good as anybody else, I do not see any reason why we should go farther. I do not see why we should stand out on the housetops saying, "We want parity," and then, just because the treaty gives us the right, go beyond parity.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. Does this bill carry any provision for the construction of 6-inch-gun cruisers?

Mr. TABER. It does not.

Mr. BRIGGS. That program, so far as it is concerned, has already been acted on apart from the treaty?

Mr. TABER. The only 6-inch-gun cruisers which have been authorized by Congress were the block of 10 of the *Omaha* class which were built, the last of them, about four years ago, if I remember aright. The Appropriations Committee, of course, will not bring in any appropriation for cruisers that have not been authorized.

Mr. BRIGGS. They have been completed?

Mr. TABER. Yes; they have all been completed as authorized. The only cruisers that we are completing are the 8-inch gun cruisers.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. What, in your opinion, will be the status of the limitation of the five principal world powers in 1936? Will they all be built up to parity? Will they meet in conference and say, "This is as far as we can go"? We can not go below this figure, according to the idea of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTON]. The idea is to build up to the limit. You say it is "a privilege." That is not the proper word, in my judgment. It is a limitation.

Mr. TABER. It is a limitation beyond which we must not go; but whether we should go so far or not depends on the exigencies of the situation year after year.

Mr. ARENTZ. Of course, between now and the year 1936, if we shall have built up to the limit in 1936, it seems we could with very poor grace ask for a decrease of tonnage in armament among the five great nations. Of course, if Great Britain and France build up to the limit we must do the same. If we build up to the limit, Great Britain and France and Italy will build right up, ship for ship.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. It seems to me an entirely fair assumption in determining the standpoint upon which the treaty was based that the amount of tonnage prescribed for the United States was in the judgment of our representatives in London the measure of what our Government required in the interest of the national defense.

Mr. ARENTZ. No; not that, but rather what the poor fellows working in the mines and shops and in the fields can pay.

Mr. TABER. I do not believe we should build for the sake of tonnage. I believe we should build solely for the purpose of national defense.

Mr. ARENTZ. I am glad the gentleman has so stated. That is my viewpoint.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. That is also my viewpoint. That is what the parity prescribed in the treaty means.

Mr. TABER. The treaty prescribes a definite limit to which we and other countries can construct. It is going to require the scrapping of those ships which because of age would be scrapped, and it will save a tremendous amount of money in operation and in new construction, without in any way impairing our national defense. It will require Great Britain to either cut out all 8-inch guns on her building program or to scrap approximately 60,000 tons of large new 8-inch-gun ships.

All this should command and have the support of all Americans. It adequately takes care of our national defense, and at the same time it results in a tremendous national saving besides being a great step forward in the limitation of armament and toward the peace of the world. Future treaties undoubtedly will go much further toward the desired limitations which are to come.

Now, I want to take two or three minutes in discussing the aircraft situation in America. We have talked a lot about battleships and cruisers and destroyers. When this Navy bill goes into effect the American Navy will have 1,007 airplanes, and when the Army bill goes into effect the Army will have 1,607, or a total of 2,629 more than the useful planes of any other country.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What does it cost to build a modern plane now?

Mr. TABER. Anywhere from \$30,000 to \$115,000.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What were those we had down here the other day? Were those scout planes?

Mr. TABER. They were all kinds. Those I have mentioned range all the way from big bombing planes to transport carriers, carrying 15 or 20 people. The Navy planes, of course, are

a little more expensive than the Army planes because they have to be manned on the decks of ships.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. May I have five minutes additional?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield to the gentleman five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes additional.

Mr. TABER. The Navy at the present time has 1,007 pilots. The Army will have, under the bill which has just been passed in the Senate, 1,350.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I desire to announce as present in the gallery a very distinguished son of Great Britain, a former member of Parliament, one who has served with distinction in many cabinet positions, lately British ambassador to France, the Earl of Derby. [Applause, the Members rising in salute.]

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TABER. In addition to those, we have 330 Army reservists on active duty and about 70 naval reservists, so that we have practically about 2,500 aviators.

The art in that, as well as almost every other branch of defense in the United States, is well up to the mark where we can say that we are proud of the American Navy. We believe it is strong enough to meet every demand upon us for national defense and that we are going ahead fast enough to meet the situation in this country. [Applause.]

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have asked this time in order to refer to some of the aspects of the system of procedure now in effect in the House.

There has been frequent, and it seems to me well-justified, criticism of a practice to which I think this is a good time to direct attention. The naval bill brought before the House last Friday is one of the most important of the annual appropriation bills. It proposes an expenditure of over \$375,000,000 and many of its provisions will probably invite serious discussion. The debate was opened last Friday by the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, Mr. FRENCH, of Idaho, in a very able and elaborate address, and he was followed by the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Mr. AYRES, of Kansas, in a similar address. Then while those addresses were fresh in the minds of the Members, the bill was laid aside for the purpose of general debate, which will continue for how long no one can at this moment say.

As we all know, the general debate will not often touch the bill under consideration, but consist of speeches on a great variety of topics having nothing whatever to do with the Navy or its money requirements. This is according to a custom not established by a rule but which has grown up during the course of years.

When the general debate closes, the bill will be taken up under the 5-minute rule, but according to another custom a large part of the time may be consumed in the discussion not of substantial amendments but of pro forma amendments.

It seems to me that the better practice would be not to interrupt the consideration of any bill by general debate except on the bill itself, and not to allow pro forma amendments, which have the inevitable tendency of diverting debate away from the essentials of the bill. This would make for the more steady and coherent consideration of bills, to say nothing of the time which would be saved.

I am glad to find that the view I am presenting is that expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] in his work on Legislative Procedure, with which I suppose all of us are more or less familiar. I refer to him because no one here has more thoroughly studied the history and theory of procedure. I quote an extract from his book on the matter of general debate:

After the opening speech explaining the bill, which is really useful, the many hours devoted to general debate—that is, debate not confined to the bill—drive most of the Members to their offices. * * * For the most part, though, general debate is sheer waste of time and a pitiful reflection on the capacity of our greatest representative assemblage to use intelligently and efficiently its precious hours.

And in the following extract he makes this suggestion:

Remove general debate (as far as that means talk not relative to a pending bill) to a definite limited part of each session or a certain session in each week.

In other words, he deprecates the present practice, but would afford Members who desire to discuss irrelevant topics an opportunity for doing so. I suppose that he would favor a rule confining debate to the bill under consideration and another rule to name days or hours when general debate will be permissible, or, better still, to authorize the leader of the majority from time to time, with the approval of the House, to arrange for general debate when no bill is actually under consideration.

So far as the matter of pro forma amendments is concerned, Mr. LUCE has this to say:

In Congress the attendance upon general debate has become so ridiculously small that Members hungry for a hearing are more and more invading debate under the 5-minute rule with irrelevant discussion. They get the chance by use of the wholly artificial and somewhat absurd device known as the pro forma amendment. The man who wants to interject something foreign will move to strike out the last word of the paragraph under consideration, or the last two words, or will go through the form of opposing such a motion.

Martin B. Madden, a level-headed Representative from Illinois, drew attention to this in the House January 6, 1920, deploring the tendency and giving figures to show its effects. He had found that in the long sessions consideration of three of the appropriation bills under the 5-minute rule had taken 4½ days in the Fifty-seventh Congress, 4½ in the Fifty-eighth, 10 in the Sixtieth, 16½ in the Sixty-second, 19½ in the Sixty-third, 22½ in the Sixty-fourth. After that the war made conditions abnormal. He thought that most of the debate had come to be foreign to the pending question and believed the "liberalizing" had gone much too far.

Mr. LUCE would probably agree that with a definite rule confining debate to the bill and a rule denying the right to offer pro forma amendments the Speaker or the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole would have no difficulty in so restricting discussion as to avoid the results depicted by Mr. Madden.

Personally I believe that it would be a mistake to prevent Members from expressing their opinion on any topic pertaining to the conduct of the Government or of the public interest, and with me the main thought is that when bills are brought before the House it is altogether desirable that they should be dealt with continuously, as far as possible, from start to finish without the work being broken up by the practice of turning the debate into irrelevant channels.

In his work Mr. LUCE recognizes, as everyone must, that while it is important to protect parliamentary procedure from sudden or ruthless disturbance, on the other hand it is a great mistake to believe that some bad features should be tolerated simply because they are hoary with age.

I shall not be sorry to recall on leaving the House that I have not looked on the system of procedure as having any such sanctity as to forbid changes from being suggested.

Accordingly I have had some connection with the successful effort to have the House informed in advance of the business to be transacted on a future day or days; some connection with the requirement being adopted that no rule providing for the consideration of a bill shall be sprung suddenly on the House but shall be reported to the House and remain on the calendar for at least one day before being taken up for action; and some connection with the consolidation of 11 comparatively useless expenditure committees into a single great Committee on Expenditures, which has the opportunity of keeping in touch with the executive departments and agencies and assist in guarding against irregularities and maladministration. All of this is simply illustrative of improvements which may safely be made.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the protective policy of this Government is vicious in its discriminations in favor of certain industries and against others. It is a game of greed and power. It gained impetus as a protection for certain powerful interests which feel that tariff protection is their exclusive right and privilege. Every inch of advance that agriculture has made in order to get protection has been fought bitterly by these interests. They not only want to confine it to certain industrial interests but are unwilling to let the policy of protection spread out over the entire country to embrace all manufacturing industries. They want to confine it to certain sections of the country and to certain kinds of industries and withhold it from the industries of other parts of the country. We had an illustration of that attitude in the action of the House on May 2 and 3, when the very men who stand here as the sponsors of the protective policy demonstrated that when they get outside of their own particular interests and sections of the country they are against protection. They are for protection only for themselves, but are for free trade for the remainder of the country. While parading under the rôle of protectionists they are, in fact, the greatest free traders in the world. The

West is beginning to wake up to this Doctor Jekyll-Mr. Hyde duplicity.

Governor Hartley, of the State of Washington, reflects the sentiments of the people of the Pacific Northwest toward this protection for the East and free trade for the West policy in certain communications, which I shall now read:

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Olympia, May 9, 1930.

Hon. SAM B. HILL,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HILL: Am inclosing to you herewith copy of telegram sent to Senator JONES and other Republican Members of Congress this evening. Am sending this to you in order that you may be advised of the action direct.

Am also inclosing copy of wire from the Hon. R. P. Lamont under date of April 28 and my reply thereto.

Yours very truly,

ROLAND HARTLEY, Governor.

OLYMPIA, WASH., May 9, 1930.

Hon. WESLEY L. JONES,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

During the Senate committee tariff hearings on the lumber schedules it was clearly brought out and is confirmed by the recent report of the Tariff Commission to President Coolidge that imported lumber and particularly shingles coming from British Columbia were the product of labor 35 to 40 per cent oriental.

The historic protective policy of the Republican Party was primarily designed to protect the American manufacturer and workman from these exact conditions and in denying a duty under the pending tariff bill on logs, shingles, and lumber, are we to understand that the Republican Party in power and the administration in Washington are in favor of a busy Hindu or Chinaman in Canada and an idle American workman in Washington or Oregon?

This is exactly the issue and we demand a roll call in the House and Senate when the subject comes up for final consideration. Let us see who favors the Chinese under these conditions.

During the Fordney tariff 50 per cent of the shingle industry has migrated to Canada and unless now stopped by protective features in the present law the entire industry in the Pacific Northwest will be lost within a few years; a condition and not a theory. In Washington, D. C., this may be an incident. In Washington State a disaster.

Please transmit copies to all Republican Members of Congress.

ROLAND H. HARTLEY,
Governor of Washington.

OLYMPIA, WASH., April 28, 1930.

Hon. ROLAND H. HARTLEY,
Governor of Washington, Olympia, Wash.:

The President, in furtherance of cooperative measures with you to improve the economic situation, would appreciate it if you would review for him the present situation in your State. For such purpose perhaps you would advise him of your opinion as to the situation by reply to one or more of the following questions: First, is there now more than usual unemployment in your State? Second, if there remains substantially abnormal unemployment, has there been a decrease since mid-January? Third, has there been a decrease since April 1? Fourth, does the outlook warrant an expectation of still further decrease during May? Fifth, if there now remains unusual unemployment, can you make a rough estimate of the number? A reply by Wednesday will be greatly appreciated.

R. P. LAMONT,
Secretary of Commerce.

OLYMPIA, WASH., May 9, 1930.

Hon. R. P. LAMONT,
Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C.:

Have delayed replying your wire April 28 hoping for a protective duty on forest products. Nothing new to give you except that the situation steadily grows worse, and if there isn't relief in the form of a protective tariff on lumber and shingles 30 days will see 20,000 to 30,000 more men added to the unemployed. The most serious situation that has prevailed in this State since 1893.

ROLAND H. HARTLEY,
Governor of Washington.

On this subject I wish also to present a telegram signed by about 40 lumber and timber companies operating in Washington and Oregon, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., May 6, 1930.

Representative SAMUEL B. HILL,
Washington, D. C.:

We interpret present status of the lumber tariff as conclusive evidence of the continued disregard of western interests by the East. Their Senators and Representatives, after securing high protection for products

of their own States, have further strengthened their political fences by defeating tariff on shingles and lumber, which their constituents consume. They do this depending on the well-known regularity of the western Representatives to give the votes that will carry the bill as a whole. Lumber and shingles are more vital to prosperity of Oregon and Washington than all their other products combined. We insist that western Senators and Representatives now announce their refusal to support tariff bill with their principal product left out. On account of Russian and Canadian lumbermen using the United States as a dumping ground for their surplus product, there is now a 25 per cent unemployment in this industry, and unless there is early relief this unemployment will be increased to 50 per cent. Burden of this will be laid directly at door of our Representatives in the National Congress. This is not intended as a threat but a plain statement of fact.

Dant & Russell, Inman Poulsen O'Connell Lumber Co., Longbell Lumber Co., Eastern & Western Lumber Co., Willapa Lumber Co., Western Timber Co., Cobbs & Mitchell, Willamette Valley Lumber Co., Umpqua Mills & Timber Co., West Oregon Lumber Co., Clark & Wilson, Forcia & Larsen, Snellstrom Bros., Planet Lumber Co., Lewis Lumber Co., Pacific Spruce Corporation, Winchester Bay Lumber Co., Moore Mill & Lumber Co., Flora Logging Co., Scott Rafting Co., Snider Shingle Co., Gerlinger Lumber Co., Chas. R. McCormick Lumber Co., J. Neils Lumber Co., Libby Lumber Co., Western Lumber Co., Westport Lumber Co., Silver Falls Timber Co., Hammond Lumber Co., Gustina Bros. Lumber Co., Eugene Transport & Milling Co., J. H. Chambers & Sons, Booth Kelly Lumber Co., Bohemia Lumber Co., Fischer Lumber Co., W. A. Woodward Lumber Co., Owen Oregon Lumber Co., Jones Lumber Co., Tideport Logging Co., Tidewater Mill Co.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Washington. I yield.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does not the gentleman think that the substitutions now being used in building are partly the cause of the trouble and not the lumber and shingles that come in from Canada?

Mr. HILL of Washington. Unquestionably, keen competition comes from substitute roofing and building material. The depression in lumber products is also aggravated by the fact that all of the substitutes are protected by a tariff, and our lumber and shingles are not protected.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It was stated that we sell \$2 worth of lumber to Canada to every 60 cents worth of lumber that we get from Canada. Can the gentleman state whether that is correct?

Mr. HILL of Washington. I would not like to make a definite statement as to that, because I am not really advised.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a short answer to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] as to the effect of substitute products?

Mr. HILL of Washington. I yield.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. That question is very well answered by the fact that the Canadian lumber business in the last few years has increased 160 per cent, and the shingle production has increased 400 per cent, while American production of both has been decreasing. There is a 400 per cent increase in shingles in Canada, while just across our line, with the same timber, but with American workmen instead of Chinese, Hindus, and Japanese, there has been a decrease, and our workmen are idle.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Washington. I yield.

Mr. LINTHICUM. In my section of the United States very few of the old shingles are used. In fact, they are prohibited in the cities by legislation, and only country people can really use shingles.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Only 11 per cent of the roofing used in this country is of wood shingles. The other 89 per cent is of substitutes for wood.

I wish to call attention to the fact that Massachusetts is solidly for protection for Massachusetts, but that on the export-debenture provision to protect agriculture and on the question of protection for the lumber and timber industries of the West and the South Massachusetts voted 100 per cent for free trade. This is in line with the attitude of the eastern manufacturing interests since the beginning of the protective-tariff policy in withholding the benefits of that policy from other interests. In this connection I call attention to an article that appeared in the Century Magazine, in the issue of May, 1928, written by William E. Dodd, on the subject "Shall Our Farmers Become Peasants?" Mr. Dodd called attention in that article to a letter written by one Abbott Lawrence, a business man of Massachusetts, about 1828, the letter being addressed to Daniel Webster, in which he stated, in effect, that if the then pending tariff bill should be adopted it would keep the South and West in debt to

New England for a hundred years. That prophecy came true. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KORELL].

Mr. KORELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein an editorial from one of the northwestern newspapers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KORELL] asks unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORELL. Mr. Chairman, a consideration of the bill that is pending before the House at the present time involves a discussion of the question of security. I might say, as an introduction to the remarks that I expect to make, that I believe we should have a Navy that will be adequate to protect our commerce, our coasts, and our country. I also believe in protecting American industries and American workmen. Accordingly I am a firm believer in the principle of a protective policy.

The few thoughts that I desire to offer on the question of security will be directed to that phase of the discussion which relates to economic security; in other words, to the principle of a protective policy.

The United States Tariff Commission has made careful and exhaustive investigations and rendered full and complete reports on logs and red-cedar shingles showing lower wages, lower costs, and prices of logs, and lower transport rates in lumber and shingle production in Canada than in the United States, notwithstanding these findings of the Tariff Commission it has been repeatedly claimed by lumber and shingle tariff opponents that wages, costs, and rates are higher in Canada than they are in the United States.

It has been definitely and conclusively shown and admitted by silence or failure of denial that every witness that appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House or the Finance Committee of the Senate opposing lumber and shingle tariffs was an owner of foreign mill and timber interests, an importer or the agent or employee of foreign mill and timber or importing interests. In other words, that they represented foreign interests against American interests. This fact has seemingly received little or no consideration.

In the hearings held by the committee Canadian statistics were presented. They showed that lumber production had increased 160 per cent in Canada during the past 10 years. Tariff Commission figures show that British Columbia shingle production has increased 399 per cent since 1913. Department of Commerce records of production show a decrease in such production of 10.9 per cent since 1925, and the same records disclose that shingle production has decreased 27 per cent since 1913. All these facts are seemingly ignored.

There must be a reason for the enormous production gains in Canada and the large decrease in production in the United States. Canadian producers are not more efficient than American manufacturers. Canadian workmen, which are about 45 per cent oriental, are in no wise superior to American workmen. Canadian mills for the most part use American machinery. The reasons for Canadian gains and American losses can therefore lie only in the fact that Canadian tariff laws afford benefits and advantages to Canadian lumber and shingle production and that the United States tariff laws handicap and discriminate against the production of American lumber and shingle products, even for the United States markets. No other reason or cause can possibly be assigned.

Lumber prices to the mills have declined from \$31.78 per thousand feet in 1923 to \$25.61 in 1928, according to the census report of lumber, lath, and shingles, but retail prices to consumers have remained almost as a whole exactly the same to the ultimate consumer.

I will ask leave to insert a comparative table of figures showing lumber production, shipments, and orders for the years 1925 to 1928, both inclusive.

Year	Production (M feet)	Orders (M feet)	Shipments (M feet)
1925	40,519,613	38,684,200	39,770,073
1926	37,950,210	37,375,441	37,945,096
1927	35,237,917	35,003,432	35,115,113
1928	34,070,321	35,351,895	35,161,798

These figures indicate that from 1925 to 1928 production of lumber in the United States declined 6,449,000,000 feet. The decline in orders amounted to 3,332,000,000 feet and the decline in shipments 4,608,000,000 feet. No industry could go through such conditions as indicated without being in what anyone would call a depression. In fact, any industry is in a depres-

sion when it can not produce and sell at least 80 per cent of its marginal production at cost or profit. The lumber industry is not and has not been in a position where it could market 50 per cent of its production at cost or profit.

These facts are ignored by lumber and shingle tariff opponents because they are unanswerable, and all of the claims, charges, and assertions of lumber and shingle tariff opponents that have been presented to date are baseless and incorrect. They can not be sustained by any kind of fair or careful analysis.

I desire to make a few very brief answers to some of the charges and assertions that were recently made on the floor of this House by the opponents of lumber and shingle tariffs.

On May 2 reference was made to the protests of foreign nations, and the statement was made—I quote the speaker's words:

In the press to-day you will read where the Government of Canada in its budget yesterday raised its tariff rates, and raised them to a retaliatory equal to the rates in the present bill, with the statement that if this law goes into effect they will be raised to be on a parity with this law.

The gentleman, whose words I have quoted, should have gone further and said that articles and editorials have repeatedly appeared in the press against lumber and shingle tariffs. He could have truthfully stated, as a matter of fact, that all of such articles and editorials have emanated from the influence and propaganda or misrepresentations of American and Canadian mill or timber and importing interests whose sole aim has been and is now to protect their foreign investments and importing interests regardless of costs to the American public.

He could also have added to his statement the assertion that these foreign interests are fighting to hold the Canadian market to their exclusive benefit and still to retain the American markets as a free outlet for their surplus lumber products. Such is the case, and the opponents of lumber and shingle tariffs are helping these foreign interests to accomplish their aim. They are assisting to "hog tie" American labor, American business, and American industry to the benefit of the cheap Hindu and oriental labor of Canada and the peasant labor of Europe. To be more specific and direct, they are aiding the foreign mill and timber investors to enrich themselves at the expense of the American people.

It seems astonishing that Members of this House should speak of retaliatory rates in connection with lumber and shingle tariffs. Canada has not threatened to increase her lumber tariffs should Congress propose a tariff on lumber and shingles. On the contrary, the Members of the House must know that Canada charges a 25 per cent tariff against United States lumber products or an average tariff of from \$4 to \$10 per thousand feet of lumber. Accordingly, the argument of the speaker, whose words I have quoted, must be that a Canadian tariff of from \$4 to \$10 per thousand feet is just a retaliatory tariff against the United States free lumber and free shingles, or again he might mean that those amounts would be "retaliatory equal" to the 75 cents American tariff per thousand feet of lumber which he urged this House to vote down on the 2d of May.

Not a single one of the gentlemen who spoke against the lumber and shingle tariffs stated that during all of the fight for lumber and shingle tariffs before Congress Canada has not made any offer to remove her lumber tariffs in an effort to afford American labor and American lumber products the same opportunity in Canadian markets that Canadian labor and Canadian lumber and shingle products now enjoy in American markets. Neither the speaker whose words I have quoted nor any of the American lumber and shingle tariff opponents have even hinted or suggested that it might be fair for Canada, in view of free lumber and shingle markets in the United States, to somewhat nearly play a fair game and open her markets to American lumber and shingle products like the markets of the United States. Canada has no such object in view. The Canadians figure, and very properly so, that as long as their Canadian lobby can dictate lumbering-tariff policies to the American Congress there is no need for generosity or fair play on the part of Canada.

In this connection I might say that during President Taft's administration it was proposed that a reciprocity tariff should be put into effect between Canada and the United States. But after the United States Congress had passed favorably upon such a proposal Canada turned its thumbs down upon it.

Mr. CROWTHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KORELL. With pleasure.

Mr. CROWTHER. Does the gentleman from Oregon realize that Canada is the only country in all the world that for all the period since the war has refused to make any change in her

tariff duties? Every nation in the world has revised and raised its tariff duties since the period of the war, including the safeguarding of key interests of Great Britain in 1920, to which they have added very considerably as the years have gone by.

It is only very recently that there has been any activity on the part of Canada with reference to a revision of their tariff and that was because of a political discussion in their last election and is not on account of the American tariff, as the gentleman has suggested and is justly criticizing. It is due to the subject being discussed very considerably in the last election, and the realization that they were losing out or were suffering intensely because they had allowed their tariff walls to stand and everybody else in the world had raised barriers against them.

Mr. KORELL. I believe the gentleman's statement is absolutely correct, at least, it is in full accord with my understanding of the situation.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KORELL. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. If there is a tariff on our lumber products it would indicate a competitive capacity on our part, which contradicts the need for a tariff on their products.

Mr. KORELL. On the contrary, I intend to cite the gentleman some figures a little later on in my presentation to the House that will show that that is not the case.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. What is the significance of a tariff on our lumber products if we can not compete with Canadian lumber interests?

Mr. KORELL. The object of it is to keep the Canadian markets exclusively for the Canadians and to keep the American markets for the Canadians at the same time, whereas what I am advocating is that we should give the American lumbermen a fair opportunity in their own markets by protecting them from competition with lower priced foreign lumber manufactured with cheap labor and with lower transport costs.

Another thing that the gentleman might have stated—and he would have been entirely correct if he had done so—that Canada charges an export tax of from \$1 to \$2 per thousand feet of logs when shipped to American markets and that the Canadian Government restricts, limits, and prohibits log shipments to American mills, and he might have truthfully added that American lumber products are effectually barred from Canadian markets. These facts were presented to the Ways and Means Committee. They have repeatedly been presented in various ways for the information of Members of Congress.

The opponents of lumber and shingle tariffs pose as friends of the farmer. They favor large farm tariffs. But how they will benefit the farmer with large tariffs and still drive the farmers' best customer—American labor—to idleness and so pauperize him that he can not buy the products of the farm is a miracle yet to be performed. Lumber industry idleness at present, according to labor and Department of Labor statistics, totals close to 400,000. The present amount of lumber workmen idle is merely decreasing purchasing power one-half. It is lessening the daily purchases approximately \$800,000 or yearly purchases upward of \$292,000,000. Fully 60 per cent of this fall off in purchasing power will be reflected in reduced farm-product purchases. So the farmer stands to lose \$172,000,000 yearly in sales through the deceit and deception of foreign propagandists that have driven American labor to idleness.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KORELL. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I would like to emphasize that when you put 400,000 laborers out of work that means you have put 2,000,000 people on half rations; that means your farmer is going to sell about 1,000,000 loaves less every day of the year, and it means you are going to sell millions fewer of shoes, of work shirts, suits, hats, and everything else which the workman and his family use. That is the effect of putting 400,000 men permanently out of employment, and the Members of this Congress who voted only a few days ago to continue that situation all over this country apparently have little regard for the workmen in their own factories and for the farmers in all of the States of this Union whose markets are curtailed by the condition they are enforcing. They are giving employment to orientals just across the line who are not permitted to come into the United States and compete with our workmen. I am opposed to their entrance to the United States, but even then we would feed and clothe them from our farms and factories, but we permit them to compete with our workmen and be fed and clothed by a foreign country. This policy is grossly unfair to everybody in this country.

Mr. KORELL. That is very true. But what I said just preceding the gentleman's statement is not all. There are many kindred and dependent operations to lumbering activities. They too are being forced to idleness and will shortly sustain losses.

Among these I might mention the railroads, merchant marine, saw manufacturers, machinery houses, leather-belt makers, chain, cable, and wire manufacturers, tool houses, and many other manufacturers too numerous to enumerate. General commerce always shares in losses, distress, and idleness, and the final result of the collapse of the lumber and shingle industries will be that American labor, American business, and American industry will lose approximately \$500,000,000 yearly just to satisfy the greed of American investments in foreign mills and timber.

Idleness will only serve to create greater farm surpluses, to lower farm-product prices, to completely destroy the home value of farm tariffs, to depreciate mill and business properties, to produce mill and business failures, and in the end depreciate farm values, and at the same time increase farm taxes and taxes on other properties remaining out of the bankruptcy courts. Such are the certain and inevitable results from idleness to labor and industry. From that there can be no escape, for government must continue. Taxes must be paid. And when factories, mills, and mercantile establishments pass out of existence that forces increased taxes on remaining properties. Farms are of the soil and indestructible, and must therefore eventually bear the brunt of any distress that exterminates industry and commercial activities.

The intent of Canada is clearly to retain her lumber tariffs for the purpose of holding her markets for Canadian production, Canadian labor, and Canadian industry. Against that there can be no just complaint. That is Canada's fair right. It is a sound national policy through which Canada has obtained and now holds an enormous lumber and shingle production advantage over lumber and shingle production in the United States, and Canada can not be blamed for retaining those advantages as long as the United States Government will permit their retention.

The gentleman from Iowa, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and one who should know the real facts, stated "the lumber situation is different from any other situation we have." So it is. No other industry is discriminated against as is the lumber industry. It is the football in connection with the pending tariff bill. Never before have foreign interests so arrogantly attempted to dictate the tariff policies of an American Congress, and never before have American and Canadian interests so brazenly threatened to defeat all Members of Congress from certain sections for reelection if they should dare to vote for lumber and shingle tariffs. That is the situation that is "different from any other situation we have." It is the bold effrontery of the Canadian lobby in the United States.

The gentleman further stated, "There are shingle mills that have gone broke. Lumber mills have gone broke."

He admits the industry's distress and the needs for tariff adjustment, but he nevertheless demands a free market for the foreign lumber and shingle products of foreign interests. He claims timber ownerships have had much to do with mill failures and refers to charts and claims showing timber holdings. With the greatest respect for the sincerity, industry, and learning of the gentleman from Iowa, I respectfully submit that if he had only taken the trouble to even casually examine the reports from which his charts were prepared he would have instantly seen that they are misrepresentative.

Reference to these reports are most interesting, even if they are thoroughly in error. They are found on page 5492, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, November 13, 1929, and somewhat revised on page 4373, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 27, 1930. It was claimed the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. and affiliated interests own 60 per cent of the timber of the State of Washington. That claim having been proven false from the face of the survey, the claim of ownership was later reduced to 37 per cent in the revised report. The timber stand of Washington is 282,645,481,000 feet. The Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. and affiliated interests are represented, according to actual additions of the listed holdings in the survey, to own 57,600,000,000 feet, and according to the statement on page 4570 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to own 100,000,000,000 feet, or control that amount. The latter amount is more than three times the actual holdings of the Weyerhaeuser Co., and the misleading statements show the resort to which lumber and shingle tariff opponents have gone in attempting to hide the real tariff issues involved.

It is interesting to note that the Snoqualmie Lumber Co., a Weyerhaeuser company, is said to own or control 7,000,000,000 feet of timber in King County, Wash. The Snoqualmie Co. actually owns less than 2,000,000,000 feet, and the 5,000,000,000 feet remaining, which it is represented the Snoqualmie Co. controls, is the property of the United States Government. This can be verified from Government records in the city of Washington. But little mistakes like these are minor matters to

Canadian lobbyists when they are seeking to hide their real reasons for opposition to lumber and shingle tariffs.

The figures of this Canadian lobby survey afford many very interesting revelations. For instance, there is a disclosure of how the lobby secure their data. Upon this point it will be noted that the tables submitted show the Milwaukie Land Co. as the owner of 7,500,000,000 feet and that this in turn is represented as being the equivalent of 8 per cent of Washington's timber. What is 8 per cent of 282,645,481,000? It is 22,611,638,480 or 2.6 per cent, but 8 per cent sounds bigger than 2 per cent. Hence the larger figure has been used.

Take the case of the Long-Bell Lumber Co. The percentage shown is about doubled. Many other percentages are also erroneously represented. The same queer figuring appears in the charts exhibited in the House of Representatives on May 2. Many of the figures appearing in the charts were taken from the survey. Figures in the remaining charts, with one exception, while spoken of as Tariff Commission figures, show upon their face that they are merely the figures of the Pacific Lumber and Inspection Bureau, an organization without any official standing. They do not correspond with the Government figures that are obtainable here in Washington.

As I have already stated, the listed large company holdings, including Government timber, and all other errors, total 105,300,000,000 feet. That is just 4.5 per cent of 2,214,000,000,000 feet, which is the total Nation's timber stand. There must, therefore, remain for the little fellow and numerous other holders of timber 95.5 per cent, and this is owned by 946,871 American farmers and other citizens of 46 States of the Union. The Canadian lobbyists represent the fight to be against the timber owner, and it must therefore be against the little fellows owning 95.5 per cent of the Nation's timber as well as against the 4.5 per cent of the big fellows' interests. However, timber ownership is just a bit of smoke-screen to hide the interests of the foreign mill and timber owner who wants to retain American markets as a dumping ground for his surplus products.

The gentleman exhibited a chart showing an export to Japan of 316,023,000 feet of logs from Washington, Oregon, and British Columbia. The Department of Commerce in Bulletin No. 3, Domestic Exports, shows the United States export to have been 20,272,000 feet of fir and 282,237,000 feet of cedar. That shows the United States shipped about 90 per cent of the asserted total instead of 71 per cent, and it also shows that the person who furnished the figures for the Congressman was merely guessing.

No explanation is given of the fact that 89 per cent of the total shipment is of cedar, nor of the further fact that a very considerable portion of the export is Port Orford cedar, grown only on the west coast of Oregon, and a wood purchasable only from Oregon and very much preferred by the Japanese.

The export lumber claimed as going to Japan presents a different case. The gentleman stated it to have been 667,349,936 feet. The same bulletin referred to shows the United States export to have been 415,249,000 feet. Some other country therefore must have shipped 252,100,000 feet, or 37 per cent of the alleged total, instead of 28.9 per cent.

The export to China is given as 377,957,457 feet. Again the same bulletin shows the United States shipment to have been 123,072,000 feet, or that nearly 70 per cent, instead of 11.7 per cent, was shipped by some country other than the United States.

Other numerous errors in the export figures appear in the same proportion to those noted, but the ones checked are surely sufficient to show that the figures of the Canadian lobbyists are utterly unreliable. There is no telling how, when, or where they got them. It is highly probably they were like Topsy—they "just grew."

Neither should it be overlooked in making comparisons that the American lumber business is a business of 125,000,000 people. That of Canada is a business of only 10,000,000 people. A Sears-Roebuck store should hardly be compared to a corner grocery when it is sought to compare amounts of business.

The gentleman from Iowa presented a chart assertedly prepared from Tariff Commission figures showing higher shingle production costs in British Columbia than in Washington and Oregon. The Tariff Commission pointedly stated that log, labor, and transport rates were lower in British Columbia than in Washington and Oregon. That is a fact well known to the gentleman, and it is verified on pages 7, 11, and 21 of the log report, and 11, 23, 49, and 72 of the shingle report. There is not and can not be any question as to higher costs in Washington and Oregon if credence can be placed in the Tariff Commission's report and the duly constituted tariff fact-finding body of the United States.

Concerning the Russian menace, the gentleman from Iowa stated that Russian lumber sold for \$38.74 per thousand feet. No doubt he is correct if he is quoting a retail price, but if a

wholesale price, some consideration should be given to what is otherwise reported. The Soviet Union Year Book, 1929, states the returns to Russian exporters amounted to \$14.50 per thousand feet of lumber, and that such a procedure is and has been productive of devastation and waste, but they are conditions forced from the no lumber protection tariff policy of the United States that forces unequal competition with low production costs of foreign lumber and shingle producing nations.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KORELL. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to comment on that Russian situation. In the tariff debate the other day it was emphasized that we had little competition from Russia, and a letter was read from somebody in the Department of Commerce stating that we would probably not have much competition within the next few years, but on the day that speech was made on the floor of this House representatives of the Soviet Government were examining and studying lumber mills in the State of Mississippi with a view to taking the same kind of mills into Russia for the purpose of cutting up confiscated timber, and those mills to be operated by workmen who receive the equivalent of 50 cents a day, in order that they may ship their lumber here and compete with our lumber producers and with our workmen. I say they were in this country the day that speech was made examining our mills with a view to taking large numbers of these mills into the Russian and Siberian forests to compete with us.

Mr. KORELL. I believe the gentleman's statement to be correct. The letter to which he referred was a letter from Mr. Axel H. Oxholm.

The letter, at most, contained merely a mass of guesses. The Soviet Union Yearbook for 1929 relates the plans of the Soviet Government for lumber production, expansion, and exploitation. Regardless of what Mr. Oxholm or anyone else may guess, the historic fact remains that Russia has quickly jumped to first place as a nation in lumber exports, and that lumber production expansion has increased faster than was either planned or anticipated by the Soviet Union.

This is the history of the lumbering industry of the Northwest for the past 17 years, and in addition to waste and devastation, forced by free lumber and free shingles, the unprofitableness of lumbering operations have greatly retarded reforestation activities, and repeated and continued periods of mill idleness have almost completely stopped the reclamation of cut-over lands. These enormous losses will not fall only to the people of the Northwest. They will spread, as I have already stated, to every section of the Nation, to the manufacturers of the East, the planter of the South, and the producer of the West and Mid West, for lumber workmen total hundreds of thousands and they buy in all the markets of the Nation.

The gentleman from the State of Minnesota, the home of the opposition to lumber and shingle tariffs, because of the fact that a considerable number of Americans live there who have large investments in Canadian mills and timber, is a staunch opponent of lumber and shingle tariffs. He argues for free lumber, free shingles, and high farm tariffs, but says comparison of farm tariffs with lumber and shingle tariffs are unfair comparisons. Both are products of the soil, crops produced from the same lands; the difference being that it takes longer to produce the timber crop than it does to raise the wheat, oat, corn, or hay crop.

The gentleman makes the statement:

Income tax reports for the year 1929 show that a large number of lumber and shingle mills in Washington and Oregon that own their own timber have prospered, and they are prospering.

It should be noted that the gentleman specifies the year of 1929. It is an absolutely safe assertion that he has no report of the income taxes for 1929, and if he doubts the losses of lumbering operators he should refer to the report of the Commission of Internal Revenue of date of May 14, 1929, showing the combined net incomes of 37 representative lumber and shingle manufacturing companies engaged in lumbering operations. This report shows that in 1923 these 37 corporations lost \$86,573, that they lost \$66,658 in 1924, that they made \$96,514 in 1925, that they lost \$38,182 in 1926, and that they lost \$37,622 in 1927. It is also perfectly safe to assert, because it is a positive fact, that these 37 representative corporations lost money during the years of 1928 and 1929, but the report did not and could not have included those years at the date of the report.

A recent investigation has been made by the National City Co. of the fir-lumber industry. Because it so clearly shows the depressed condition of the industry I ask leave to incorporate a brief statement made by the National City Co. as a result of its investigation:

During a brief period of approximately 15 months, commencing in the autumn of 1926 and extending into January, 1928, the National City Co. had rather close contact with the fir-lumber situation of the Pacific Northwest, and undertook a survey of conditions in this industry. The survey embraced not only an economic study of the lumber situation generally, but an analysis of balance sheets and earnings statements over a period of five years of approximately 100 different concerns engaged in logging or manufacturing operations, or both.

"The combined balance sheets of 104 concerns showed current assets of approximately \$38,500,000 and current operating liabilities and accruals of \$11,600,000. Their fixed assets of all kinds were carried on their books at approximately \$240,000,000. Their liabilities other than current operating liabilities aggregated approximately \$90,250,000, of which approximately \$63,000,000 were funded and the balance represented by current obligations. As against this portrayal of resources and liabilities, the most striking factor developed by the figures was the low annual earnings returned from the employment of this vast aggregation of timber resources, mill facilities, and man power. The figures speak for themselves. After providing for operating charges, depreciation, and depletion, there remained as net income available for the payment of interest and taxes the following sums:

1922	\$9,715,000
1923	17,034,000
1924	253,000
1925	1,873,000
1926 (deficit)	105,000

"That the fir-lumber industry by the end of 1926 had reached a low ebb of vitality is the only possible deduction from the analysis given."

Considerable comment has been made about Canada being the best customer the United States has. A glance at the lumber and shingle exports to that country does not confirm the statement. Past statements have shown we annually import from Canada about 1,500,000,000 feet of lumber and 2,229,000,000 shingles. According to the Department of Commerce Bulletin No. 3, Domestic Exports, we shipped to Canada in 1928, 140,906,000 feet of logs and other lumber products, and that we exported to Canada 7,286,000 shingles. The lumber export is about one-tenth as large as the lumber import from Canada, and the shingle export to Canada is about 0.035 per cent of the shingle import. Recent press reports show a decline in Canadian imports from the United States and an increased export from Canada to the United States. The final analysis of the Canadian import question is that they buy from us what they do not themselves produce or can not purchase elsewhere at a lower cost. It is rather absurd to pretend they buy from us through a desire to be our patrons or to show us special favors. The rule of buying in all cases of imports is to buy where the desired article can be purchased at the lowest cost, and that is Canada's policy, the same as that of any other nation.

Much stress has been placed on the question of mills owning their own timber. There are thousands of mills in the United States that do not own their own timber. They are the little fellows that to date have helped to prevent too great a centralization of mill and timber ownerships. They are the mills that have very largely helped to keep down the prices of lumber and shingles but seemingly they are the mills, these little fellows, that the opponents of lumber and shingle tariffs would seek to destroy. If it be the aim of lumber and shingle tariff opponents to create greater centralization of mill and timber ownerships they are certainly working strongly to that end, for the foreign mill and timber interests are the large interests and as soon as the small interests can be destroyed and the little fellows driven to bankruptcy the big fellows on both sides of the international boundary can then combine and demand whatever price they may wish for their products, but first they must destroy the little mill and bankrupt the little fellow. A moment's thought will clearly show there is more real danger of increased lumber prices from centralized ownership of mills and timber than could possibly result from any tariffs Congress might be induced to place against foreign importations of lumber and shingle products.

In conclusion, I insert part of an editorial of The Morning Oregonian appearing in the issue of that paper dated May 6, 1930. It summarizes the situation of the Northwest and states the alternatives that are faced by the representatives of the lumber States.

LUMBER HIT BY COMBINED BLOCS

Joining forces in an unnatural alliance, the agricultural Mid West and the industrial East dealt a severe blow to the lumber industry of the Pacific coast and the South by refusing to place any protective duties on forest products. The old fight for free raw materials that enter into protected finished products is renewed. Formerly the industrial East fought to place products of the farm on the free list or under low duties. In the tariff struggle now drawing to a close the Democratic-

Insurgent coalition from the Mid West and the South has contended for more protection on farm products, no increase on manufacturers, but these contending forces combined to deal a body blow at lumber. All of which shows that each element forgets protection as a national policy, votes for its selfish interest, and the devil take the interest that is short of enough votes.

If there were such a thing as gratitude in tariff politics, the lumber States would have a strong claim on the farming States for some return for aid given in obtaining farm relief laws. The delegations from the Pacific Northwest States have at times gone beyond reason in supporting the claims of agriculture, but there has been no reciprocity. The lumber industry is the best home market for the farmer, but he does not hesitate to throw it away for the sake of cheap lumber.

American lumber is now exposed to attack from all sides and is utterly undefended by the tariff which protects almost every other industry. Russian lumber is driving the American product out of Japan, China, and northern Europe, where Finland also enters the contest. Expatriated American capital imports Canadian lumber in competition with the American product of capital that has remained American. Exposed to severe competition in both the domestic and the foreign markets, the American lumberman must buy food products on a highly protected market but must sell his product in a free-trade market. He can make with good cause the same complaint which the farmer has made without cause. He may now choose between forming a lumber bloc to secure protection and becoming an out-and-out free trader in order to reduce his cost of production.

But the battle yet to be fought out over the debenture and the flexible tariff raises doubt whether the tariff bill will become law in any form. On those two issues the majority of the House stands firmly behind President Hoover. The latter's letter to Representative TILSON is a plain intimation that he would veto a bill providing the debenture. The case for legislative instead of executive control of the flexible tariff has been made too weak to stand against the President's argument. When Congress has consumed 15 months over a tariff bill, there could be no assurance of prompt action on a bill to revise a single duty or that such a bill would not be extended to the entire tariff. Being able to boast of having gained much for the farmer, the Senate coalition might well hesitate to lose this advantage by inviting a veto against which it could not muster a two-thirds vote of both Senate and House.

The lumber States can view the possibility of a veto with indifference, for they have nothing to lose by it, having already lost all they hoped to gain. A veto should tame the arrogance of the farm bloc and may teach the farmers that to trample on all other interests is not the best way to serve their own. Their power to gain the utmost for their group of interests has reached its climax in the present tariff debate, and the profit is dubious. That is the result of rupturing parties and building factions out of classes or sections.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SINCLAIR.]

A SYSTEM OF RESERVOIRS FOR FLOOD CONTROL AND AS AN AID TO AGRICULTURE AND NAVIGATION

Mr. SINCLAIR. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, during the hearings held about two years ago by the Committee on Flood Control of the House, there appeared before us Hon. John F. Stevens, chief engineer in the building of the Panama Canal, and the man whose plans for that great undertaking were adopted. Among other things, he stated at that time that "sufficient data had not been accumulated in order to prepare a comprehensive plan of flood control" for the floods on the Mississippi River and its tributaries. That statement, Mr. Speaker, coming from so eminent an engineer, probably the foremost in this country, impressed the committee most profoundly. That idea was embodied in the legislation which was later prepared, being the specific section in the law enacted May 15, 1928, providing for the study and survey of the tributaries of the Mississippi River system.

To-day we are facing the necessity of amending the flood control act and still, notwithstanding the fact that provision was made for obtaining authentic information for our guidance in determining a comprehensive plan, enough progress has not been made for us to determine upon a plan. I am advised by the War Department that these surveys of the tributaries provided for in the law are now being made as rapidly as possible, and that a preliminary report may be expected this summer, or before the next session of Congress. A great deal of statistical material has been collected already, both scientific and accurate, which, while valuable and convincing to some, still is not sufficient as a basis on which to build the greatest engineering work ever undertaken in this country.

When Congress passed the present flood control act we were forced to act hastily and upon immature plans because of the great pending emergency. The plans of the Chief Army Engineer seemed the best within the limits of cost set for us. No one seriously believed that the Government could take a large

acreage of farm or timbered lands for flood and spillway purposes without just compensation to the owners, and it was obvious to Congress that that part of the plan was sure to meet with opposition in the courts. That is exactly what has happened. The courts have restrained the Government from proceeding without first paying for the rights which it seeks to exercise over private property. In consequence of this action, President Hoover, therefore, has very wisely withdrawn all construction work on this portion of the flood plan until the whole question can be again reviewed by the engineers for further recommendations to Congress.

The feasibility of fuse-plug levees and flood ways has been the subject of much conflicting opinion among engineers, as well as laymen, ever since this method was advanced in the Jadwin plan. Prominent engineers familiar with the floods of the Mississippi have pronounced them inadequate and of doubtful value. In addition, the flood ways required to carry a super-flood must now be paid for in advance, and this will involve an unjustifiable expense. It was in accordance with that view that the obligation of finding a better and cheaper plan was thrown back on Congress by the President. The adopted project included in the act of 1928, besides providing for the strengthening and raising of the levees and completing the river-bank stabilization, also provided for three main flood ways. In the case of a maximum flood it was proposed to pass the water from the main channel of the river into the flood way by fuse-plug levees in order to reduce the flooding at certain points. One flood way was to be located in Missouri, another in Arkansas and Louisiana, and the third in Louisiana below Red River to the Gulf. This plan was adopted by Congress in the thought that the damages for the flooding of private property would be assessed when the damage occurred, estimated to occur at intervals of from 3 to 10 years. However, the courts have taken a different view of the matter, and have held that by express design of the plan these areas are to be flooded and used as flood ways, and that the damages expected are due to the property owners at the initiation of the flood-control works.

The three main flood way or storage areas provided for are on the west side of the river. The citizens of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mississippi insist that there are two additional storage basins on the east side of the river, not provided for in the Jadwin plan, but nevertheless equally damaging to their property as a result of the proposed works on the opposite side of the river. The flood ways contemplated, however, are the Missouri diversion in southeast Missouri, the Boeuf Basin flood way in Arkansas, and the Atchafalaya River in Louisiana. The amount of water to be diverted down these flood ways is to be controlled by levees made of softer or looser earth which will give way or blow-out when a certain height is reached by the river. In the opinion of many engineers, these levees are of doubtful control. No one can say accurately with what force or volume the water from the main channel will pass out into the flood way, nor whether it will cease to flow through, once it breaks over when a given volume has been released.

It is sufficient for our present consideration to know that it will positively inundate a large area and ruin the property of many people, and that this will be done deliberately by a pre-meditated plan of the Government to do that very thing. It is obvious that the Government must then be responsible for the damages to private property resulting therefrom.

The Missouri flood way embraces an area of about 145,000 acres, affecting 3,500 people, dispossessing them of their homes and property, and costing approximately \$30,000,000. The Boeuf Basin flood way contains 1,440,000 acres with a backwater area of 1,085,000 acres additional. The population now living in this basin is about 70,000, and the value of the land used as a flood way is estimated at \$126,000,000. The Atchafalaya flood way covers 1,190,000 acres with a population of about 40,000. The cost of this flood way is estimated at \$180,000,000. Here is a total additional expenditure of \$336,000,000 which the Federal Government must assume if it should complete the flood works contemplated in the adopted project.

Further, there is at least another \$300,000,000 of estimated damages in these flood-way areas, to railroads, highways, towns, cities, telephone and electric light properties, river improvements and revetments that must be counted in, according to the estimates submitted to the committee two years ago by General Jadwin. At that time it was held that all this expense should be borne by the local and State interests. It is safe to assume that the total cost to the Federal Government of the adopted project under the act of May 15, 1928, with the additional interpretations by the courts in recent decisions, would be well over a billion dollars.

When the legislation was under consideration by Congress many Members were troubled by the conflicting phraseology of

the bill. It provided for an adopted project and the creation of a commission to make further studies and surveys, and that this commission should reconcile the adopted plan with other plans suggested by the commission, and that if full approval could not be had as to all the engineering differences, the commission should make a recommendation to the President. The result of all this seemingly conflicting language is that approval of the flood-way portion of the Jadwin plan has not been given by the President, and all progress on that phase of the work has been held up for further study. The difficulty was that Congress faced a grave emergency at the time of the enactment of the legislation, and attempted to pass a comprehensive flood control bill without sufficient data on which to base it. Many Members knew that the bill as passed could never be carried out without the expenditure of a vastly greater sum than was proposed in the measure. The same problem is still before Congress and will require definite action when the surveys and studies to be made on the tributaries become available.

Practically every engineer of note who appeared before the Flood Control Committee voiced the opinion that the ideal plan for controlling floods on the great Father of Waters is by means of reservoirs. The only question raised was that of cost. No accurate estimate was presented or obtainable as to the cost of this mode of control, and therefore in the law as enacted section 10 was inserted which—

Provides for the survey of all tributaries of the great river with a view to controlling flood water by means of reservoirs and their effect upon floods in the lower valley, the benefits that will accrue to navigation and agriculture from the prevention of erosion and siltage, the capacity of the soils to receive and hold waters, the income to be derived and the extent to which such waters may be made available for public and private uses, and the stabilizing effect on stream flow of the retained waters as a means of preventing erosion, siltage, and improving navigation.

It is believed that this method of flood control will prove to be entirely effective, and it is in the interest of national economy that it be given most careful study. These surveys provided for in the law should be prosecuted to completion at the earliest possible date in order that the information thus obtained be made accessible to Congress, and legislation for a permanent and comprehensive plan expedited. The present law makes no provision for saving these run-off waters. It proposes to waste forever what should be conserved as a great natural resource.

Source stream control for the elimination of floods on the Mississippi River is no new proposal. We find that it has been suggested from the very earliest history of floods on the great river. However, this method has been given no consideration for the last 40 years because the Army engineers were so thoroughly convinced of the superiority of their plan of "levees only" that they gave no thought to any other. Even after the great calamity of 1927 both the Chief Engineer of the Army and the Mississippi River Commission, with a record of 40 years of monumental failure back of them, made the levee system the basis of their recommendations. They merely increased the dimensions of the levees, with diversions and spillways added.

Reservoirs and source stream control was given only the most cursory notice. With reference to the inadequate treatment of reservoirs by the Board of Army Engineers, I feel that it is not amiss to call attention here to the fact (in order to indicate the bias and prejudice of these men) that the officer detailed to make the examination of some 500 reservoir sites as a possible means of flood control was not only an officer of the Army but was also at the same time acting as an executive of a large utility and power company. He was on half pay with the Army and giving most of his time to the power company. He made what might be termed a worm's eye or swivel-chair inspection of the 500 reservoir sites and rejected practically all of them as flood-control factors. Since then it has developed, through the investigations of another body, that the power companies were engaged at that very time in the wholesale business of buying and influencing newspapers, the teachers, schools, and colleges of the Nation in an effort to discredit public ownership, development, and control of electric-power sites and electrical energy for the use and benefit of all the people. Would it be too much for us to infer that they had also made overtures toward effectively influencing the views and opinions of the engineers of the Army?

President Hoover is an able engineer, and he very promptly stopped all diversion and flood work provided for under the adopted project when the courts decided that the owners of this property embraced in the floodways must be paid for it in advance. It is now up to Congress to provide some other plan. In the meantime the work of bringing the levees up to the standard grade and section can be pushed vigorously to comple-

tion. Also, bank revetments and channel stabilization can be continued in the interests of navigation. These works are of a permanent character and will take several years to complete. Then, when the tributary surveys and studies are available, a final plan of flood control can be adopted by Congress. I am convinced that when the report of these investigations is before us the wisdom of reservoir construction as a means of flood control will be fully demonstrated.

There is enough evidence from various authentic sources to indicate the success of source stream control as one of the factors of this comprehensive plan. In addition to terracing and soil absorption, the proposal includes a system of reservoirs in the upper regions of the basins of the Missouri, the upper Mississippi, the Ohio, the White, the Arkansas, and the Red Rivers and their tributaries. Preliminary studies disclose the fact that there are known reservoir sites on each of these streams which will afford storage facilities adequate to reduce flood stages at Cairo, Ill., to the extent of 11 feet during a possible maximum flood. It is believed by some that this reduction may be increased to 20 feet. Had such a control been in effect in 1927, there would have been no flood damages in the lower Mississippi River. There have been detailed surveys made by competent local engineers of reservoir sites having the following storage capacities: On the upper Mississippi River, 4,000,000 acre-feet, which will give a reduction of stream flow of 60,000 cubic second-feet; on the Missouri River, 15,000,000 acre-feet, with a reduction of stream flow of 300,000 cubic second-feet; on the Ohio River, 10,000,000 acre-feet, which will give a reduction of 300,000 cubic second-feet; on the Arkansas and White Rivers, 34,000,000 acre-feet, with a reduction of stream flow of 500,000 cubic second-feet; and on the Red River, 6,500,000 acre-feet, with a reduction of stream flow of 100,000 cubic second-feet. These reservoirs can all be built at an estimated cost of \$400,000,000, or a unit retention cost of \$6.50 per acre-foot. This sum is held by able authorities to be a very reasonable figure. Flood rates of the rivers in 1927 were, respectively: Upper Mississippi and above Cairo, Ill., 537,000 cubic second-feet; Missouri, 655,000 cubic second-feet; Ohio, 1,000,000 cubic second-feet; White and Arkansas, 1,250,000 cubic second-feet; Red, 60,000 cubic second-feet. Consequently further reductions in the discharge of these rivers during floods can be made by additional reservoirs with increasing the capacities of those reservoirs already known and under consideration. The annual discharge of these rivers is as follows: Missouri, 82,000,000 acre-feet; Ohio, 143,000,000 acre-feet; Arkansas and White, 46,000,000 acre-feet; Red, 42,000,000 acre-feet; upper Mississippi, 78,000,000 acre-feet.

There has been a very complete and detailed survey of reservoir sites made on the headwater tributaries of the Ohio River by the Pittsburgh Drainage Board. The results of that survey show that at a very reasonable cost the flood heights in the city of Pittsburgh can be reduced approximately 10 feet by the building of a series of 12 dams and reservoirs. These facts are set forth in the report made by the Flood Commission, which are available to anyone who wishes to look into the matter. It is suggested in that report that the reduction of flood heights on the Ohio River can be increased 20 feet by utilizing all of the available sites known.

I am more familiar with the upper Missouri River. In the State of North Dakota there is one reservoir site on the Missouri River above the city of Bismarck which is capable of storing 15,000,000 acre-feet. This proposed reservoir site has been very carefully investigated and a detailed survey made by Mr. R. E. Kennedy, State engineer of North Dakota. His plans and estimates are for the construction of a reservoir in the Missouri River by means of a large earthen dam with a steel concrete core. He proposes to build a dam over 2 miles long with a maximum height of 175 feet above the river bottom, and a spillway of 1,500 feet. The capacity of the reservoir would be 30,000,000 acre-feet, and the cost is estimated at \$47,500,000, or \$3.30 per acre-foot. Siltage would be deposited in a lake at the upper end over a 60-mile area which would take 230 years to fill. The dimensions of the lake would be 140 by 1½ miles. Mr. Kennedy believes that such a reservoir will store at least 40 per cent of the run-off waters of the Missouri River drainage basin. His conclusions are that this improvement will effect the discharge of the Missouri River by reducing the flood flow at least 80 per cent at Bismarck, and will increase the low-water flow at least 70 per cent at the same point. In other words, it will have the effect upon the river of giving it a stabilized flow, and will insure a constant uniform depth of channel throughout the year, which is absolutely necessary in the promotion of water navigation. The Government has spent for dredging purposes alone on the lower Mississippi River approximately a

million and a half dollars each year for the past five years. With a stabilized flow in the tributaries this vast expenditure could be practically discontinued. This feature is especially important in the case of the upper Missouri, for that river carries 80 per cent of the total siltage of the Mississippi River system.

It is estimated by well-informed authorities that the annual amount of siltage carried or delivered by the Missouri River is over 450,000,000 cubic yards. This amount of solid matter discharged into the lower river makes it imperative, in order to maintain navigation, to appropriate money continually for dredging purposes. If we are ever to have a fixed and permanent channel on these rivers we must devise some means, either by reservoirs or otherwise, of preventing erosion and siltage along the length of the upper streams. No better means has been suggested than the reservoir system. The creation of storage in the upper Great Plains region by impounding the waters in natural reservoirs and ravines will be valuable not only for flood control but for navigation, irrigation, water supply in towns and cities, sanitation, and electrical power. The diversion channels through which part of the waters thus stored may be conveyed will add greatly to the reforestation and vegetation which the Government is so interested in promoting. All of this will materially increase the national income by promoting the vegetable, animal, wild fowl, and fish life of the country. Such a diversion channel is contemplated in my State, should a reservoir system be adopted. The channel will carry waters from the Missouri River across certain portions of North Dakota, touch the headwaters of the James and Sheyenne Rivers and empty into Devils Lake. The level of this lake will be raised 26 feet, thus restoring it to its original height as it was in 1881 when the country was surveyed.

This diversion project is particularly needed for the health and sanitation of perhaps 50 small towns and cities in North and South Dakota. All of these towns have an inadequate water supply, and the healthfulness and sanitation of their communities is thereby endangered. Weather Bureau officials claim, with the increased storage of seepage waters due to this diversion of flood waters, that the rainfall of the State will be heavier. In North Dakota, weather observations indicate that the evaporation from the soil in the last 30 years has been greater than the rainfall. This is gradually using up the surplus waters of the subsoil, and if not checked, the soil must eventually become dry and barren. This condition prevails in much of the Great Plains region.

Through diversion, the extra waters now running to waste to the ocean can be conserved and returned to the land, where it will become valuable to our agriculture. Such a plan will be a real farm relief, for the increased unit of production, without additional expense, will convert the farmers' labor from loss to profit. It is my belief that with similar storing of the excess waters of other streams and tributaries of the Mississippi River, and diverting them through the soil, the maximum floods on that great stream can be reduced at least 25 per cent. Before such a plan can be formulated it is necessary, of course, that a complete study and survey be made. It should be submitted to the judgment of a board of expert and impartial engineers, who should have the authority to select the best features of all plans. Surely, on the rolls of 20,000 American civil engineers, such a board can be selected, capable of solving this problem. The work contemplated is to last for all time, and should be of such a nature as will afford the greatest safety and economic value to the Nation as a whole.

A further benefit to the people of the Great Plains region resulting from river improvements will be the development of water transportation. This area now pays the highest freight rates on its products of any in the Nation. The wheat farmer in North Dakota pays on the average 8 cents a bushel more to have his crop transported to the terminal market than does his neighbor farmer across the border in Canada, with whom he must compete. Water transportation would greatly reduce the costs to market on all perishable products. The promotion of navigation on the Mississippi River will tend to cheapen freight rates in the whole region. The farmers of North Dakota ship approximately 200,000 carloads of their own products annually to markets outside the State, and pay a freight bill on them of about \$50,000,000. Shipment by river would cut this freight charge very materially. No more certain "farm relief" could be enacted by this Congress than that which will effect cheaper freight rates.

I have but briefly suggested the probable benefits that will accrue from terracing and soil absorption. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] has been instrumental in having legislation passed authorizing the Department of Agriculture to make studies upon that subject. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STONE] has also given a great deal of thought and study

to this phase of the question, and I believe is working on a plan for future legislation that will encourage local interests and individual farmers to do a great deal of this terracing work and conserve the waters at the place of their origin. These efforts deserve the encouragement of the National Government, and such a program of conservation and control of our greatest national asset—water—should have the heartiest cooperation and encouragement from this Congress. I believe that when the proper steps have been taken our flood waters can be turned into a blessing of mighty economic value to the Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUDSON].

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to express my appreciation of the forward step in world peace by the adoption of the London pact, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks thereon.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, in the time of the general debate on the naval appropriation bill to-day I desire to express my satisfaction in the accomplishments of the London Naval Conference. It will go down in history as of as great importance and significance in its results as the Washington Armament Conference.

The vision of President Hoover in the calling of the conference has, in a large measure, been realized. The Nation rejoices with him in its accomplishments. The people of this country will support him in any further steps that may be taken toward the establishment of a better world understanding and the lifting of the burden of taxation from the shoulders of our citizenship that is caused by the maintenance of an excessive armament.

I want to pause a moment to express the appreciation of myself and, I believe, the Members of this House for the splendid work of the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], and his colleagues in the preparation of the bill, for their diplomacy in awaiting the outcome of the London conference before reporting on a naval expenditure for the coming year; the thoroughness with which they have discussed the provisions before us, which are so technical, and the fairness of their discussions where there could easily be bitter contentions. The Nation is to be congratulated in having a chairman of the committee so diligent in preparation and so judicial and candid in his presentation. The Nation desires as large a holiday in armament construction as possible in harmony with the needs of national defense.

In this age when inventive genius and scientific skill make obsolete so quickly our ships and planes and guns we need to have the greater care in huge expansion programs. I for one believe our committee has reported a bill which has tried to safeguard us in this regard and shall heartily support its provisions.

President Hoover has called it a great step in world peace because it has brought the consummation of—

final abolition of competition in naval arms between the greatest world powers and the burial of fears and suspicions which have been the constant produce of rival warship construction.

Thus is recorded a long step to the organization of a world peace. The Kellogg pact, with the conversations of Prime Minister MacDonald and President Hoover, laid the ground work perhaps for a greater advance. The hope of a war-sick world had looked eagerly for a larger measure of achievement. The minds of rulers of the nations have not as yet received the new furniture that Premier MacDonald spoke of. The old passions, prejudices, suspicions, and jealousies have not entirely vacated the reasoning of these minds. There are those who will contend that naval armament has been achieved, and on the other hand there are those who will as stoutly contend that a substantial reduction has been made possible.

In the final treaty all five powers agree to a complete battleship holiday until 1936. Three powers—the United States, Great Britain, and Japan—agree to limit their naval programs in all classes of ships for a period of six years, or until 1936, and France with Italy agrees to continue their efforts toward an understanding which will be in unison with the other powers.

Our concern must not be with naval parity. The gentleman from Idaho has well asked what is meant by parity. What we need to be concerned with, and that only, is an adequate defense. This may be had and will be had without building to the limit possible under the treaty. We should not go to its limit, which might easily be a burden of \$1,000,000,000 in the period covered by the treaty.

The limitation agreements are in reality far more important than the reduction provisions in the establishment of international confidence and world peace.

HOPES FOR FUTURE

In part 5 which provides for the treaty becoming effective, there is contained an important provision providing for another conference in 1935, at which all five powers will be present.

Disarmament can not be accomplished by a single act. It must come step by step as the powers grow more confident. It is our hope that the cause of disarmament will receive added momentum from the London treaty and that the conference in 1935 will bring further steps looking to disarmament. We went a long step forward at this London conference in the agreement for a battleship holiday and for scrapping battleships.

The United States, Great Britain, and Japan have agreed to proceed at once with a reduction of their battleships in numbers to 15, 15, and 9 respectively. This will mean a scrapping of nine capital ships among the three powers, totaling about 230,000 tons each for the United States and Great Britain and 105,500 tons for Japan. Each of these powers is allowed 52,700 tons in submarines, a light reduction. In the three classes, battleships, destroyers, and submarines, we have slight reductions. In airplane carriers no reduction. The figures remain the same as the Washington conference. A cruiser basis of between 323,500 and 339,000 tons has been allocated to the United States, which, if we should build to the full allocation would mean an actual increase in our tonnage of the cruiser class.

I want here to insert a table prepared by Chairman French showing the exact status of our relative armament.

The United States, Great Britain, and Japan—at the time the conference convened and as it will be authorized under the proposed agreement.

Tonnage built, building, appropriated for, or fixed by Washington conference as of January 15, 1930, contrasted with tonnage under London conference agreement

[Data for January 15, 1930, from data sheet compiled by Office of Naval Intelligence, except authorization for aircraft carriers, which is taken from Washington treaty; data for London conference is from statement of President Hoover of April 11, 1930, and from apparently authentic press dispatches]

	United States		Great Britain		Japan	
	Tonnage, Jan. 15, 1930	London conference agreement	Tonnage, Jan. 15, 1930	London conference agreement	Tonnage, Jan. 15, 1930	London conference agreement
Battleships.....	Tons 523,400	Tons 1,460,000	Tons 606,450	Tons 1,460,000	Tons 292,000	Tons 1,264,900
Aircraft carriers.....	135,000	135,000	135,000	135,000	81,000	81,000
Cruisers.....	250,500	180,000	406,911	150,000	206,815	108,450
8-inch guns.....		143,500		189,000		100,450
6-inch guns.....						
Destroyers.....	290,304	150,000	196,761	150,000	129,375	105,500
Submarines.....	87,232	52,700	69,201	52,700	78,497	52,700
	1,285,436	1,121,200	1,414,323	1,136,700	1,178,087	713,000

¹ About.

² 90,086 tons, built and building.

³ 115,350 tons, built and building.

⁴ 68,870 tons, built and building.

⁵ 18 cruisers.

⁶ 15 cruisers.

⁷ 12 cruisers.

⁸ These figures for United States and Great Britain are interchangeable.

⁹ Exclusive of 47,598 tons of craft in service but over effective age. Exclusive of 86,915 tons of craft listed for disposal.

¹⁰ Exclusive of 1,695 tons of craft in service but over effective age.

¹¹ Exclusive of 69,160 tons of craft in service but over effective age.

¹² Includes 61 destroyers (63,991 tons) listed for disposal.

CERTAIN DIRECT SAVINGS

Just what money savings may accrue to the several powers or to the United States as a result of the conference in event of ratification of the treaty involves the fundamental question of whether or not the highest interests of our country and the world may be served by pursuing a moderate program within the limits laid down or by building up to the limit of authorization in all categories.

From an examination of the table it will appear that as a result of the London conference certain tonnage increases are made possible and certain reductions in tonnage required. Let us consider both factors.

Direct money savings that may be made as a result of the action of the conference, assuming treaty ratification: In the first place, as to battleships, the elimination of three battleships from the fleet of the United States is in itself no negligible item, and should result in a saving, in maintenance and

operation costs alone, for each ship amounting to more than \$2,000,000 for each year they otherwise would have remained in service.

Again, the measure provides for the extension of all battleship replacement dates until 1936. Within that time, were the United States to replace ships that she could replace under the Washington treaty, she would replace five completely; and five more would be in process of replacement, all of which, upon the basis of \$37,500,000 per ship, would make a total of \$281,250,000, which would be needed between now and 1936. No one can state to-day that that is an absolute saving. It is a postponement. But by 1936 it may well be that as a result of the conference which will meet the year before, or in 1935, battleships will be entirely eliminated or their numbers reduced to such an extent that the entire amount of \$281,250,000 now postponed may be saved to the Treasury of the United States, and with corresponding saving to other countries. Other direct savings will be made through the scrapping of certain destroyer and submarine tonnage.

FINANCIAL BURDENS AND NATIONAL BUDGETS

From the standpoint of burdens that are reflected through taxation that rest upon the peoples of the great world powers, it must be remembered that last year the organized military powers of the world, including reserves of the several powers, aggregated nearly 30,000,000 men. This burden calls for stupendous money costs. It must be remembered that during that same period the naval budgets of the United States, Great Britain, Japan, France, and Italy were close on to \$1,000,000,000. It must be remembered that the naval burden alone for the United States was more than \$374,000,000. It is more now. It can not be disputed that 72 per cent of the annual expenditures of the United States is on account of past wars or the maintenance of Military and Naval Establishments. More than that, these burdens are mounting.

I shall pass over expenses incurred in Military Establishments other than the Navy, but as to the Navy I desire to direct the attention of the House to the tremendous expanse of naval burdens upon the world's great powers as they have gone forward during the last 25 years.

Naval appropriations of leading world powers

	Fiscal year		Increase (+) or decrease (-)
	1904	1929	
United States.....	\$109,196,123	\$374,608,054	+\$265,411,931
Great Britain.....	173,548,058	278,478,000	+104,929,942
Japan.....	17,553,279	131,222,722	+113,669,443
France.....	59,740,222	99,568,000	+39,827,778
Italy.....	23,522,400	63,622,982	+40,100,582
Germany.....	50,544,000	47,764,019	-2,779,981
Russia.....	60,018,895	42,329,289	-17,689,606

Mr. Chairman, with due regard for the obligations that legislative bodies owe to their constituencies, with due regard for the sacrifice that must be made by the millions of people in all countries of not only comforts of life but in some instances bare necessities, regard must be had for ways that will mean reduction of burdens of government.

If this be true, it follows that nations may have regard for elements that in the past under competitive building had to be ignored:

First. Financial burdens and national budgets.

Second. The problem of an even load in navy yards.

Third. The effect new building or replacement will have upon craft of the several types in comparison with the craft that other nations will have when the limitation conference of 1935 or other earlier conference may be held.

Fourth. The actual need from the standpoint of defense modified as will be this need by moderation or conservatism of other nations on account of definite negotiations.

We have good reason to be encouraged in the reductions agreed upon and push forward with stronger efforts to encourage humanity to think in terms of peace rather than strife. A drive to secure a better understanding among each other as nations and an earnest effort to dispel jealousy and suspicion will lay the groundwork for further disarmament and lift the load of taxation from the people of our Nation, and the other nations of the world.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it has become in recent days a popular pastime, growing into a vocation on the part of some, to bait the Federal Farm Board,

a creature of Congress and the instrumentality which we have in this country for legitimate farm relief.

I find made a part of the records of this House on April 10, a letter introduced by a Member from my State, which is signed by one Fred A. Marsh, drawing severe strictures upon the Federal Farm Board and its membership, especially former Governor McKelvie, of Nebraska, who is regarded as the wheat member of that body and is the editor of the Nebraska Farmer.

I desire to read as part of my remarks his reply to this letter, but I desire to call your attention to page 6852 of the RECORD, containing the letter to which this reply applies.

Hon. FRED A. MARSH,

Regent University of Nebraska, Palmer, Nebr.

DEAR MR. MARSH: It seems you accepted authorship for a certain full-page advertisement published in the Central City Republican under date of April 3, entitled: "The Farm Board—The Chain Store—The American Farmer—The 3-Way Sword." Our mutual friend, Hon. EDGAR HOWARD, playfully had this inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and referred to it as a remarkable statement.

In that I agree with him—

Says Mr. McKelvie.

You quote from the editorial in Nebraska Farmer—

Which is the agricultural paper of our State, published by Mr. McKelvie—

in which it was stated that during 1929 farm-implement exports from the United States amounted to over a hundred and forty million dollars, of which 83 per cent went to 10 countries, principally Canada, Argentina, and Russia, for the purpose of growing wheat. Your thesis is based upon the theory that this machinery is sold at a lower price to the foreign farmer than to the American farmer, and Congressman HOWARD boldly states that such is the case. Had you taken the time to read the testimony of Chairman Legge before the Agricultural Committee of the Senate when the members of the board were being considered for confirmation, you would have discovered that the company of which he formerly was president never has sold a dollar's worth of machinery for export at a lower price than for domestic use.

Probably we hear no other political statement in our country more frequently repeated than the injustice that is done the farmers of this country by the machinery manufacturers in selling their product to foreign nations and their citizens at a lower price than the domestic customers are charged.

Like a great many other people, I believed this was true, because it had been said by so many people and repeated by others and not usually challenged. This is what I am contributing myself.

I took occasion a few years ago when I was in 10 countries of Europe—and I think I understand machinery as well as the average Member of this House, probably purchasing as much as any other one, maybe not more—I made a careful examination of this contention in a number of countries of Europe.

I did find this to be true, that on account of the lack of horsepower or other form of power they did use smaller and inferior machinery to that usually manufactured for American use, but I know enough about machinery and made the comparison so I feel safe in looking my fellow Members in the face and saying that the prices paid there were not beneath the prices that are paid here in America for the machinery bought and used. I was not, however, in Russia.

Mr. CLAGUE. Will the gentleman permit an observation of my own?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. CLAGUE. A few years ago I drove out to one of my farms on which I have a renter, and he was just setting up a Massey-Harris harvester which is manufactured in Canada. I was a little surprised, and I said to him, "How did you come to buy a Massey-Harris harvester?" He said, "I could get that for \$218 and a McCormick or a Deering of the same size is \$230." I had to go to Canada and was in the Saskatchewan country about a month after this, right during harvest time, and I found that the Massey-Harris of the same make and same size, was sold at Conquest, Saskatchewan, and at other points where I was interested, for \$295 and the McCormick or the Deering was sold for \$295, the same price. The McCormick and the Deering were sold here for something like \$60 more, but the Massey-Harris, made in Canada, was sold there at the same price.

Mr. SLOAN. Yes; and the machine made in America was sold higher in Canada than it was here in the United States.

Mr. CLAGUE. Yes; about \$70 higher.

Mr. SLOAN. That was my experience and that was my observation. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his excellent contribution of fact.

This is testimony given by the man who probably knows more about it than any other living person, the chairman of the

Federal Farm Board. I was not entirely satisfied, and I made inquiry of what is considered by many as the best and most reliable authority on this subject. Within the last month I made inquiry of the Department of Commerce of the United States and asked what was the real fact. I was informed about the investigations that had been made. So frequently had the question come up, so frequently had the assertion been made, that they had instituted investigations as best they could comparing machine prices throughout Europe and here in America. The result of their investigations was that the statement that machinery made in America was sold cheaper in foreign lands than it was in America was unfounded.

And yet Congressmen sometimes will present letters making statements of that kind, when, as a matter of fact, an investigation among those who would know would have prevented any such error being made. There is often a theory involved and boldly asserted that if the real facts do not fit with the theory, then so much the worse for the facts.

Now, to proceed with the letter:

Let us then proceed from that point. Implement manufacturers are selling their machines for export at the same price as in this country. Is this an offense, considered in connection with the advice of the Federal Farm Board to the American wheat farmer to reduce acreage?

Probably the use of these implements will facilitate an expansion of wheat production in foreign countries. That would come about anyway, for every country that can grow wheat is redoubling its efforts to do so, and, American machinery or not, the American farmer never can compete in the world market with cheap lands, peasant labor, and low water transportation of foreign countries that produce wheat. Bread is the staff of life and no country is going to subject itself to the control of that essential food by any foreign country, if it can avoid it. Maybe this would not come about as soon were it not for the use of American farm implements, but to disregard the fact that it will come about, and in the meantime not to provide against a thing that is inevitable, would be to play the ostrich. The Farm Board sees no practical way to make the tariff on wheat effective, except to reduce production to substantially a domestic-consuming basis.

That may be unwelcome to a great many people of the United States. But that is the method for making the tariff effective, and at the same time providing food for the American people. We all know that following every war the first means of recovery have been increasing simply the product of corn, which means maize, wheat, or barley, or the principal grain, whatever it may be, because it is the quickest way to recover. The only reason we have had good prices for wheat is the failure of the great wheat fields in Russia to recover from the effects of the war. I have no doubt that that will yet occur, and the wise men in America, both as to corn and cotton, will see to it that their production comes more nearly to the demand of the people of this country—the greatest market in the world—worth, all products concerned, ten times more than all the other markets on the globe.

Meanwhile the American implement manufacturer who increases his volume by exporting at the domestic price keeps American labor employed and reduces the cost of his machines to the American farmer. This is the very opposite of theories that would encourage the American farmer to produce more and sell the exportable surplus at a lower level than the domestic price. It should be borne in mind that there is no tariff in this country on farm implements. True, there is a tariff on steel, but the amount of that tariff reflected to the farmer in a binder is so small as to be almost negligible. The noticeable item is the increased cost of labor that goes into that binder. This labor in turn consumes the products of the American farm. Is it the desire to strike at our home market by subjecting American labor to the level of living conditions of foreign labor?

Next, by some stretch of the imagination you undertake to associate the Federal Farm Board program with chain-store activities by calling attention to a request of the chain stores that the tariff on frozen beef, frozen mutton, and frozen lamb be not raised. Certainly that shows a disposition to inject prejudice where reason should prevail. While the Federal Farm Board has had nothing to do with the prerogative of Congress in enacting tariff legislation, it has been the publicly expressed opinion of this member of the board that increased tariffs on farm products that come into this country in competition with the American farmer will turn his attention more to lines of which there is no exportable surplus.

By and large, the program of the Federal Farm Board has been and will be to assist in developing a farmer-owned and farmer-controlled marketing system for the American farmer. In this, measurable progress is being made. Three national sales agencies, namely, for grain, wool, and cotton cooperatives, have been set up and are now functioning. It is the first time in our history that the American farmer has had even the prospect of exercising any control over his products at the terminal markets.

In one place you state, "While the Farm Board, in a manner that has left but a train of more and greater depressed prices after their every idiotic action, is unmanaging the staple methods of handling our grain." Well, maybe it is idiotic to assist the farmer to own and control his marketing system. I am willing to leave that to the farmer to answer. True, grain prices have declined, but that was in spite of the Farm Board activities instead of because of them. I can not reveal all of the activities of the grain stabilization corporation, for speculators in the market have been all too prompt to take advantage of any information thus divulged.

Let me say that wheat that I marketed of the 1929 crop under the assistance that has been given in various cooperative organizations I have obtained probably 25 cents a bushel more than I unfortunately shall be able to obtain for that held over from 1928, storage shrinkage and expense considered.

When all of the facts are known about that activity the American farmer and every fair-minded citizen will realize that the country was saved from a calamity in farm commodity prices equal only to what happened to agriculture shortly after the war.

Apropos of the assistance that the Federal Farm Board gave to producer cooperatives, you should recall that every important piece of legislation introduced in Congress for the relief or benefit of agriculture had cooperative marketing as the central feature. This was regarded by all of the exponents of agricultural economic progress as the great desideratum. We are undertaking to work out such a program and in the meantime have invoked the emergency measure of a grain stabilization corporation to fill in the gap, pending the complete functioning of that system. Probably producer cooperation carried to effective ends will interfere with some private interests. However much we may regret this, it is not new, nor is it within the authority of the Federal Farm Board to limit. The course of economic progress in this country is strewn with the remnants of systems that were outworn. When such systems were abandoned those engaged in them found new places of useful service. It will be so in this case. So far as this board is concerned, our job is to assist in building an improved marketing system for agriculture, and that we propose to do without fear or favor.

I can not conclude without remarking upon the strange anomaly when a regent of the State University of Nebraska, an institution that receives hundreds of thousands of dollars of Federal funds to promote education and practice in improved methods of farming and marketing, places himself squarely in opposition to another agency of the Government that is designed to do the same thing. I might better have expected that such outpourings would emanate from the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Very truly yours,

SAM R. MCKELVIE,
Member Federal Farm Board.

[Applause.]

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, we had on the floor of this House a few days ago a most remarkable address, a most significant one, one which I am sure was vitally interesting to the country. There has been a good deal of newspaper comment on it. We had also presented a conflicting opinion. I must say, as a new Member of this Congress, I have been a little bit hesitant in following the gentleman from Idaho, my good colleague Mr. FRENCH, for some of his appropriations even seem too large to me. But I am one of them that can say after the magnificent speech the other day that I am willing to follow the lead of the gentleman from Idaho so long as he stands as he did then. [Applause.]

I think this appropriation is very large. I feel that much humanitarian legislation is being neglected. I think this might be changed, but I do feel that the gentleman from Idaho expressed the sentiment of 90 per cent of the American people.

There was also presented at that time a contrary view by the gentleman from Illinois in relation to our Navy. I hope it may be the policy of the country and this Congress to follow the ideas expressed here by the gentleman from Idaho, as I understood him, rather than the gentleman from Illinois. This appropriation seems large to me now, but when we compare it with what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] wants I am for this.

There is no one more interested in adequate national defense than I. I certainly would not advocate the abolition of the police force in any city. I am one of those that believe that the country is getting better. I do not think, though, we have gotten to the place where we can abolish the police force of any important city. Neither would I advocate the abolishing or limiting beyond a reasonable degree our national defense; but I believe that here we should use discretion in regard to the Treasury and spending in the interest of worthy causes which come up from time to time.

I am a great believer in national peace and national cooperation, but I do not believe that we have gotten to the place where

we can abolish national defense in this country. I believe in the doctrine given to this Congress on that day by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], that we should have as small a navy and spend as little money as is consistent with adequate national defense. There are two conflicting ideas in this country and in this Congress. One wants to spend everything possible to build up a great navy and build great battleships to become obsolete, and another takes the view of the gentleman from Idaho. I am thankful that we have a man of that idea in this Congress, which is to build a navy that is adequate for the national defense of the country, and not to see how large a navy we may have. I think the gentleman was right when he said that it is not essential that we should build up to any limitation in agreements that we might come to, in an international conference. The agreement, rather, is that we shall not go beyond a certain limitation. If we are going to bring about world peace, we have to follow an idea like that. If I walk down the street and say that I am for peace, but at the same time go armed to the teeth I am very likely to get into trouble and not have peace. The safety and security of nations are not assured by great armies and navies. If they had been, Germany's future would have been secure, because she had the greatest army in the world in 1914, and England would never have had to go to war if a great navy had been a security against war.

I was interested in the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] that the bill which he has introduced represents the policy of the administration. I do not know the policy of the administration, and it is not necessary for me to say that, because it is natural that I would not, but I do not believe the President of the United States and those who have been close to him would say that that bill represents the policy of the administration. The President is a man who knows more probably about international affairs than any man who has ever sat in the President's chair, and he should be able to render greater service in that direction than any man who has ever sat in that chair. I have been a consistent follower of his peace utterances, and I do not believe the policy of the President is represented in the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, unless the President has repudiated some of the past addresses that he has made, and I do not believe he has.

Mr. COLE. I think the gentleman is mistaken about the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN]. He did not say that that was the policy of the national administration, but he meant the administration of the Navy Department.

Mr. PATTERSON. He certainly led the country to believe that it was the policy of the national administration.

Mr. COLE. Then he left a wrong impression.

Mr. PATTERSON. I hope he did, and I think so myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I want to lay before the House certain difficulties of the Veterans' Bureau, which are causing exasperation to the Members. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain correspondence.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. On April 15 I received a letter from Mr. Charles White, of Canton, Ohio, the commander of the Department of Ohio of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, with the astounding and almost incredible statement that the Veterans' Bureau regional office at Cleveland, Ohio, was so far behind with its work that claims for compensation could not expect attention until January of next year.

I immediately called the attention of General Hines, the Director of the Veterans' Bureau, to this charge, hoping and expecting that he would assure me that it was a mistake; but on April 30 I received the following reply:

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU,
Washington, D. C., April 29, 1930.

Hon. ROY G. FITZGERALD,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 17, 1930, relative to the situation alleged to exist in the regional office at Cleveland, Ohio, which was brought to your attention by Mr. Charles White, commander of the Disabled American Veterans of the World War, Canton, Ohio.

This subject has been receiving my earnest consideration for some time, the regional manager having reported fully to me on the subject when the situation first developed to the stage where action was deemed essential.

It is my privilege to advise you that under date of April 18, 1930, I approved the employment of eight additional personnel in the Cleveland regional office upon the recommendation of the regional manager that this additional personnel could adequately meet the demands upon the bureau resulting from the intensive drive conducted by the ex-service organization incident to the filing of claims and the submission of new evidence.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, *Director.*

I sent a copy of the letter at once to the State commander of the disabled veterans' organization and asked him to let me know promptly if after the increase of personnel promised at the Cleveland office there was still lax and inefficient service. He replied on May 7, stating that the improvement of the service was slight and that the "regional manager passes the buck to the Washington office and the Washington office passes it back to Cleveland." He also inclosed me copy of a letter purporting to be written by the regional manager of the Veterans' Bureau office at Cleveland, Ohio, on May 5, 1930, to the senior vice commander of the disabled veterans, the contents of which were recognized as so difficult of belief that the authenticity of the copy was attested by a notary public. The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU,
Cleveland, Ohio, May 5, 1930.

This letter referred to your file number: In reply refer to R-5.
Slater, Glenn C. C-1478 885.

ANTHONY J. LEBUS,

*Senior Vice Commander the Disabled American Veterans
of the World War, 204 Piper Arcade, Canton, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of May 3, 1930, Mr. Slater filed claim on January 31, 1930.

For your information, about thirty-five hundred new claims have been filed since the first of the year, and it will probably be six months before some of the veterans are examined in connection with their claims.

This explains why Mr. Slater has not as yet been called for examination.

Very truly yours,

WM. L. MARLIN,
Regional Manager, Cleveland, Ohio.

The above is a true copy.

ANTHONY J. LEBUS, *Notary Public.*

Is the condition at Cleveland, Ohio, general? If it is, immediate and vigorous measures should be undertaken to correct this intolerable abuse of our veterans.

On May 10 I wrote again to General Hines, and assuming that the breakdown of the Veterans' Bureau service was confined to Cleveland, I suggested the immediate transfer to that city of adequate help from other offices.

These conditions must not be endured. Men may die while waiting months for their physical examinations.

There is complaint of unemployment. Here is an opportunity for employment in the service of the disabled veterans which would meet universal approval.

To deny sick and suffering veterans of the late war consideration of their claims for a period of six months wantonly increases the misery of these men and their dependents, and subjects the Members of Congress, and others who are appealed to for help, to an unnecessary burden.

Many of us are familiar with the obnoxious regulation No. 73 of the Veterans' Bureau, which prevents a fair determination of claims of active tuberculosis because of the unwise and arbitrary requirements which it imposes on the sick veterans. There are other regulations or policies of the Veterans' Bureau which result in a denial of the benefits of the compensation law to veterans. I read you a letter which Members of this House have addressed to General Hines, calling his attention to what seems to be a wrongful and distorted interpretation of the law by which the will of Congress and the American people is thwarted.

It is these harsh measures of administration which create such widespread dissatisfaction, which obscure the generosity and bounty of Congress speaking for the American people. It is such policies, measures, and regulations which drives Congress to almost lavish measures of relief in its exasperation over the difficulty of getting the relief already provided to the suffering veterans for whom it was intended.

Listen to this letter prepared by our colleague, the Hon. PHIL D. SWING, one of the able lawyers of this House, and tell me if the administration of the Veterans' Bureau does not offer a field for improvement.

MAY 12, 1930.

GENERAL FRANK T. HINES,
*United States Veterans' Bureau,
Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR GENERAL HINES: With increasing frequency we note a new practice of your bureau whereby the purport and effect of an enactment of Congress is voided, or, at least, nullified in part.

Section 200 of the World War veterans' act provides:

"That for the purposes of this act, every officer, enlisted man, or other member employed in the active service under the War Department or Navy Department who was discharged or who resigned prior to July 2, 1921 * * * shall be conclusively held and taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service, except as to defects, disorders, or infirmities made of record in any manner by proper authorities of the United States at the time of, or prior to, inception of active service, to the extent of which, such defects, disorders, or infirmities was so made of record."

The basis upon which this language was enacted into law was that if a man was good enough to be taken from his home by his Government and placed in the front-line trenches to shoot at the enemy and in return to be shot at, the Government thereafter was estopped to say that the man was physically or mentally defective at the time of his enlistment unless such defects were noted at the time of enlistment; also, the Government having had their own physicians examine the man, there is every reason to presume that he was physically and mentally "in sound condition" except as to physical and mental defects found by them at the time they made an examination of him.

The bureau, I am told, under some Comptroller General's decision, has held that this language does not embrace or become operative in the case of a man who was enlisted, but who, at the time of his enlistment, had some constitutional inferiority. Hence we find from time to time, cases being denied relief on the following basis:

"Condition is in the nature of a physical or mental inferiority; not a disease or injury within the meaning of the act. Existed prior to enlistment; not noted at enlistment; evidence in file shows clearly that the condition was not incurred in or aggravated by service."

True, section 200 says compensation is to be paid for disabilities "resulting from personal injuries suffered or disease contracted in the military or naval service," etc., and if that language stood by itself, the bureau's finding that the man was "born that way" would be a complete and final answer to any and all claims for compensation. But the very selfsame section 200 contains the restriction and limitation upon the language regarding personal injury suffered or disease contracted in the service. The proviso expressly and definitely, yes, conclusively, gives service connection to all disabilities which arose during the military service, or within the specified times after discharge, unless such disabilities were noted of record at the time of the man's enlistment. The provision clothes the claimant with an armor that the Veterans' Bureau can not pierce. The Veterans' Bureau may have the most conclusive evidence that the man "was that way" when he entered the service, and yet if the "defects, disorders, or infirmities," were not made a matter of record at the time of his enlistment, they can not use their evidence to defeat his claim. Likewise, they are prohibited from saying that the man was born with the disability, because there is no difference in legal effect from saying that and saying that he was that way at the time of his enlistment. The purpose of each is to undermine and defeat the soldier's claim, and the law does not permit this claim to be attacked by a showing that it existed prior to the time of enlistment, even from the date of birth.

The law says he "shall be conclusively held and taken to be in sound condition" (and that means both mental and physical) when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service, except for defects, disorders, or infirmities made of record at the time of enlistment. Certainly, a constitutional mental inferiority is a "defect, disorder, or infirmity." If it was not noted at the time of enlistment the man is "conclusively" presumed to have been in sound condition when taken into the service. If the contention that is advanced in support of the present practice was to have a basis in law, the language would have to be changed to read "except as to personal injuries or diseases made of record at the time of enlistment."

For the foregoing reasons, which we think, at least, raise a grave doubt as to the soundness in law of your present practice, we join in requesting that you refer this issue to the Attorney General of the United States for its proper interpretation.

Respectfully submitted.

PHIL D. SWING.
ROY G. FITZGERALD.

We are all fond of General Hines. It is impossible to know him and not be fond of him. He has a great task, one of the greatest and still the most thankless in the administration. He must keep his balance in the unremitting pressure for more and more from the veterans and their friends on the one hand and the demands for economy, efficiency, elimination of waste, rigid accounting from those responsible for the sound financial program of the administration on the other. We must try to help him, and one of the ways is to point out what seem to be faults in the bureau, lest impatience and resentment over ill-advised economy lead to extravagance in legislation.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALSEY.]

Mr. HALSEY. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to discuss the billion-dollar naval program under consideration. To my thinking, the battleship as a means of national defense will soon

become as obsolete as the oxcart now is as a mode of transportation.

In addressing the House, I desire first to read a short letter addressed to me by the Hon. H. P. Faris, of Clinton, Mo. A banker of that city, an elder in the Presbyterian Church, and at one time a candidate for President of the United States on the Prohibition ticket. The letter relates to the killing of a little 6-year-old girl in February, 1928, in Henry County, Mo. The letter, in brief, is as follows:

I hear with regret that the "wets" in their eagerness to make out a bad case against the "drys" have had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the statement that the little Harigan girl, who was killed near Windsor, was shot by prohibition officers. Prohibition and its enforcement had no more to do with that killing than you had. The truth is a constable at Windsor heard a rumor that some man was badly wounded who had been seen in an automobile between Calboun and Windsor and he jumped to the conclusion that it was a bandit car and the man had probably been wounded in a bank hold-up.

He hastily summoned a posse, in which there were three Windsor bankers, and took the posse down the highway, where a car was met that seemed to fill the description. A halt was ordered. The driver, Mr. Harigan, seeing the guns, jumped to the conclusion it was a hold-up, stepped on the gas and fled. The posse, believing a criminal was trying to escape, began firing, and the poor little girl was killed.

This brief but true recital of the sad occurrence shows that neither prohibition nor the enforcement thereof had anything to do with the tragic affair, but was due to the hasty conclusions of the constable, the posse, and the driver of the car.

The officers were exonerated of all liability, both personal and official, and the bankers paid the parents something like the sum of \$3,000.

Distorting facts to gain a point gives poor support to any cause. And now, Mr. Speaker, in view of the announced policy of the Association Against Prohibition to "smoke out" every Member, I also desire to take this occasion to nail my colors to its mast as a bone-dry Member of Congress. I am opposed to the repeal of the eighteenth amendment or any modification whatsoever of the Volstead Act. Above the Speaker's platform hangs the emblem of this Nation's authority and power. That flag never retreats. This Government can do again what it did before—suppress a whisky insurrection. There are as many wet cure-alls as there are wets, for the ills of which they complain. But they may as well with rushes attempt to dam Niagara's cataract as try to substitute the State saloon for the eighteenth amendment. The American people will never put a white apron on him and make Uncle Sam a bartender for the brewer and distiller. And while American womanhood holds the ballot, the Stars and Stripes will never again wrap its sheltering folds around the wine cask, the beer keg, or the whisky barrel.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CROSS.]

PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CROSS. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I assert that if we would befriend the primary industry of this country, agriculture, if we would maintain our international prestige and avoid the destruction, sooner or later, of our billion dollar navy, if we would live up to our high pretensions and fulfill our oft-made promises and keep our national honor unsullied, then we should grant to the Filipinos their unqualified independence without further delay.

Let us visualize for a moment the geographical location of this distant tropical archipelago on the nether side of the globe, surrounded by oriental waters, bounded on the east by the Mariannas, on the south by the Celebes, on the west by the Sulu and south China Seas, and on the north by the Bashi Channel, beyond which lies the yellow peril. These islands, extending for more than a thousand miles in a general north and south direction, number 7,083, having an aggregate area of 115,000 square miles, or approximately the same as that of the State of Arizona; Luzon, with 40,000 square miles plus, and Mindanao, with 36,000 square miles plus, constituting more than two-thirds of the whole. Only 2,448 of these islands, however, are of sufficient importance to have been given names. Sibutu, the most southwestwardly of the group, is within 15 miles of the east coast of north Borneo, while the northernmost, Ibayat, is but 93 miles from the Japanese island of Formosa, or practically within modern cannon shot, while Luzon, the most important in commerce, size, and population, is but 205 miles from that Japanese stronghold, and only 450 from Hong Kong.

The distance from the city of Washington to Manila by way of San Francisco and Honolulu, is more than 11,000 miles. While from the city of New York by way of the Panama Canal it is 11,364, and by way of the Suez Canal, 11,521 miles. In such an outlandish quarter of the globe do we find these queer possessions, and to reach which it is necessary to travel

over devious, checkered routes practically half around the world.

And here in this all but inaccessible torrid region we find some 12,000,000 souls, a conglomerate of Malayan tribes, with a considerable intermixture of Chinese. Withal, a people as ultra in physical type, mental concepts, and racial customs, from the people of these United States, as can be found between the poles.

HOW WE ACQUIRED POSSESSION

That the Filipinos joined America in its conflict with Spain fully convinced that as a reward they were to be independent, there can be no question. Was not such an assumption on their part justified? Had not the American colonies secured their independence with the assistance of France? Had we not drawn the sword that Cuba might be independent, Congress declaring at the time that we had no other purpose?

Mr. LOZIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSS. I yield.

Mr. LOZIER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CROSS], of course, is familiar with the statement made by Admiral Dewey shortly after he went to Manila, that the people of the Philippines were much better qualified for self-government than the Cubans?

Mr. CROSS. Yes. There is no question about that. I am coming to that directly. Had not our consul general at Hong Kong, Mr. Wildman, as far back as November, 1897, been discussing with General Aguinaldo an "alliance offensive and defensive," in the event of war with Spain?

Thereafter, in April, in Hong Kong, had not General Aguinaldo been in consultation with Admiral Dewey to the same effect? On the 19th of May, Dewey having destroyed the Spanish Fleet as well as the battery at Cavite on the 1st, and being in sore need of land forces, had not the United States revenue cutter *McCullough* been dispatched to Hong Kong for Aguinaldo and his lieutenants, and they landed at Cavite? On the same day do we not find our consul general at Hong Kong cabling our Secretary of State, Mr. Hay, that a large supply of rifles should be sent to the Philippines for our "allies"? Not only does the record show that our consul general at Hong Kong purchased many rifles for the insurgents, which were delivered to them at Cavite with the approbation of Admiral Dewey, but that the Admiral himself had ordered delivered to them both cannon and rifles from the captured Spanish arsenal at Cavite.

Did Admiral Dewey and the Americans in command at Cavite have any doubt as to the purpose actuating Aguinaldo and his followers in taking up arms? Was not that purpose made plain by General Aguinaldo in his proclamation issued at Cavite on the 24th day of May, in these words:

I again assume command of all the troops in the struggle for the attainment of our lofty aspirations, inaugurating a dictatorial government to be administered by decrees promulgated under my sole responsibility and with the advice of distinguished persons until the time when these islands, being under our complete control, may form a constitutional republican assembly, and appoint a president and cabinet, into whose hands I shall then resign the command of the islands.

Induced by this proclamation more than 12,000 Filipinos serving with the Spanish forces deserted to fight for the independence of their country, while patriots, in swarms, flocked into Cavite to join the insurgents.

And as a result, in a few weeks, practically all Luzon, with the exception of the city of Manila, was in their possession, and with Manila bottled up and at their mercy, even being in possession of San Juan del Monte, the source of the city's water supply, so that as early as the 12th of June Admiral Dewey telegraphed, "The insurgents practically surround Manila," and that the leadership of Aguinaldo was "wonderful." And remember that Spain had concentrated her forces in Luzon and staked the fate of the archipelago upon her success or failure there. Did Aguinaldo and his followers have cause to believe they were fighting for their country's independence? Hear our consul general, Mr. Pratt, at Singapore on June 8 addressing a distinguished number of Filipinos at a reception:

You have just reason to be proud of what has been and is being accomplished by General Aguinaldo and your fellow countrymen under his command. When six weeks ago I learned that General Aguinaldo had arrived incognito in Singapore, I immediately sought him out. An hour's interview convinced me that he was the man for the occasion, and having communicated with Admiral Dewey, I accordingly arranged for him to join the latter, which he did at Cavite. The rest you know. I am thankful to have been the means, though merely the accidental means, of bringing about the arrangement between General Aguinaldo and Admiral Dewey, which has resulted so happily. I can only hope that the eventual outcome will be all that can be desired for the happiness and welfare of the Filipinos.

When General Merritt arrived with America's first contingent of 11,000 soldiers he found the Spaniards in such a helpless condition that he did not wait for those that were to follow, but immediately disembarked at Cavite, and on the 7th day of August, when he and Admiral Dewey sent a joint note to the Spanish commander that a bombardment of the city would begin within 48 hours, the Spanish commander replied that "there was no place of refuge for the sick, women, and children, as he was surrounded by the insurgents." On the 13th, when the bombardment opened, after a brief and weak resistance the white flag went up at 11 o'clock. The Americans had lost in the entire Philippine campaign but 20 killed and 105 wounded. No wonder, in view of these acts, General Anderson wrote, "The Filipinos considered the war as their war, Manila as their capital, and Luzon as their country," for had they not been led so to believe, and had not thousands of their best and bravest died that such might be true? If the spirits of the dead are cognizant of the affairs of this world, what grief must be theirs. Had it not been for the insurgents, instead of having 20 killed and 105 wounded, would we not have had thousands killed and wounded, not to mention those who would have languished with disease in the jungles?

Tell me, then, where is our gratitude when we hold these islands in the face of their protest? Does not justice point the finger of scorn at us? Is the Nation's conscience dead? Can we claim that we hold them, under the law of the survival of the fittest, as an outlet for our surplus population? Surely none would be so rash as to make such a claim. Are they covered by the Monroe doctrine or lie within the sphere of our influence? No; but, on the contrary, our retention of them puts us in an indefensible position before the world in asserting that doctrine. Are they essential to or do they even in the least contribute to our national defense? No; but, on the contrary, they are, as the sword of Damocles, suspended over our heads that Japan can at her will cause to fall.

But there be those who claim we hold them as a matter of purchase from Spain, that she ceded or deeded them to us on the 10th day of December, 1898, in consideration of \$20,000,000. But, at the time Spain executed that cessation or deed the islands had been wrested from her and she had no title to convey, she no longer exercised any sovereignty over them, but the title had vested in and that sovereignty was being exercised by the Philippine Republic, with General Aguinaldo as its president.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSS. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Does not the gentleman think that the assertion which he is making with regard to the sovereignty of Spain at that time, and what we bought, is entirely contrary to the decision of the Supreme Court in that regard?

Mr. CROSS. I do not want to talk about the Supreme Court of the United States, because the other end of the House can do that.

What think you, if England, when she saw that she had lost these American colonies, had hastened to cede or deed them to France for \$20,000,000? What think you of the validity of a title so acquired by France?

AN ECONOMIC LIABILITY—AN AGRICULTURAL MENACE

Can it be claimed that they are an economic asset? Do they add to the wealth, to the prosperity of this Nation? Only 10 per cent of our exports to the Far East go to the Philippines. I hold in my hand statistics from the Department of Commerce showing the volume of this country's trade for the first six months of 1929 with the Far East, which includes the Philippines. And during those six months we sent to the Philippines for the products she sent to us \$71,663,000, while she paid to us during the same period for the products she purchased from us only \$44,575,000. Or, in other words, every six months we are purchasing from her \$27,000,000 more than she is purchasing from us. Every time these islands buy 62 cents worth of goods from us we buy \$1 worth of goods from them. Thus 48 per cent of the money we send to the Philippines never finds its way back to our shores to sustain the purchasing power of our people, while for every dollar they send to us we return to them \$1.48. And then for this seventy-one millions plus which we biannually send to the Philippines they in turn send into this country raw products produced by the lowest-paid labor in the world, and which comes directly in competition with the products of our farms and dairies. If these imported products had been manufactured rather than raw products, who is there so simple but that does not know they would have long since had their independence that the tariff might be applied? We had as well let the peonized labor of the world pour into this country in competition with our labor as to admit the product of such labor. Its vegetable products, its coconut oil and other coconut products, in competition with our cottonseed oil, and its sugar are

deadly foes to our dairies, to our cotton fields, and to our cane and beet plantations. During 1929 there was imported into this country from the Philippines 604,501 tons of sugar, nearly four times as much sugar as was produced in the entire State of Louisiana. And as long as we hold them we can not in good conscience apply the tariff. If you are sincere in pretending that you would help agriculture, if you are patriotic and would have your country prepared in the event of war, you should not hesitate to grant independence to the Philippines.

Destroy agriculture, the industry that fills the wardrobes, the smokehouses, and granaries, and there can be no prosperity in time of peace nor victory in time of war. As the trunk is to the limbs, so is agriculture to the other industries. Truly civilization begins and ends with the plow. Tear down your dairies, give back to the wilderness your cane, your beet, and your cotton fields, and a solemn stillness will brood over your one-time busy looms, and the mouldering walls of your once proud cities will be tenanted by loathsome bats and owls. The millions of farm mortgages on record throughout the country are so many petitions pleading to you to come to the rescue of agriculture. My countrymen, the opportunity to better his condition has been responsible for every mental and physical effort that has changed man from a naked savage, with a mentality scarcely above that of the wild beast that dwelt in the same forest with him, to what he is to-day. Destroy that opportunity and you start him back to his primitive condition in that ancient forest.

In addition to being a millstone about the neck of the agricultural interests of this country, this Asiatic archipelago is a financial cancer preying upon its Treasury. The military forces we keep on duty there cost this Nation annually \$11,169,738, while we spend on seacoast defense, public health, and on the Coast and Geodetic Survey annually \$524,142, or a total for these four purposes alone of \$11,693,880. And when you add to this \$16,693,960 the cost of the so-called Asiatic Fleet kept in these waters, we have a grand total of \$28,387,841 as an annual tax upon the taxpayers of this country.

THEIR RETENTION MEANS A DESTRUCTIVE, HUMILIATING WAR

And in addition to all this, remember their retention is a national menace. We are holding a lightning rod and beckoning the lightning, Japan, to strike, and when she does our billion dollar Navy will go into "Davy Jones's locker," for Mars is as sure to use this archipelago as an incubator to hatch a war between the two nations as that the night follows the day. Remember what Japan did to the Russian fleet when they dared enter these distant seas. What think you our aircraft and submarines would do to the Japanese or any other fleet that would dare join combat with us in the waters surrounding Porto Rico or even the Hawaiian Islands? Japan operating from her base at Formosa can with her bombing planes utterly destroy Manila within the course of a few hours and, unhindered, land a powerful army overnight, and then with her submarines, which by the recent naval conference at London are to be the peer of any in the world, send our ships to the bottom as fast as they entered these Asiatic waters and with as much ease as a child pricks the bubbles in a bowl. Then at half-mast will our flag droop, as never before, in testimony of the grief and humiliation of the Nation.

PROPAGANDA—A WOLF IN SHEEP'S CLOTHES

Then, why does Congress hesitate? Why are we powerless to act? It is the same old, old story of justice being vanquished by the lance of greed plated with gold. Who of you, my colleagues, but has been flooded with propaganda emanating from the so-called Philippine-American Chamber of Commerce domiciled at No. 67 Wall Street? This avaricious group, parading in sheep's clothes, admonish us that the Filipinos are not competent of self-government and that it is the sacred duty of this country to hold in subjection these Malayan, Asiatic peoples, until, perchance, in some distant future age, they reach that delectable condition. How their altruistic hearts do palpitate with sympathy for these benighted, ignorant yellow peoples. What holy livery do these hypocrites adorn to persuade this Congress to continue to hold their victim that they may profit? How long must the farmers of this country continue to be impoverished that a few individual pirates may pile up fortunes? But if these propagandists were not actuated by a near-sighted selfishness that blinds them to their true interest they would advocate the independence of these islands. It is far better that a man should die a pauper and leave his children to live among a contented, prosperous people, where opportunities abound and thrift and industry is crowned with success, than to die and leave them a fortune but to dwell among an embittered, discontented people in a land devoid of opportunity, for an inherited fortune invariably has wings, and after having rendered its recipient incapable of coping with the adversities of life leaves him and his children's children in a hope-

less struggle with poverty. An individual fortune is of the moment and of little consequence, but our country, our posterity means to-morrow and to-morrow and all the to-morrows to come.

Not competent of self-government? Not educated? I hold in my hand data from the Bureau of Insular Affairs, and it reveals the fact that there are 7,354 public schools in the Philippines and that there are enrolled in these same schools 1,111,509 pupils and that these public schools are taught by 26,251 teachers, only 293 of whom are Americans. And, further, that there are 126 secondary or high schools. That in addition to these there are 315 private schools under Government control and at least that many more private schools not under government control. And, further, that there are 58 private institutions under government control offering collegiate and technical courses and conferring degrees. And, then, in addition to all these, there is the University of the Philippines, and while the number of students is not disclosed in the data furnished me it does give the number of instructors employed as 422, which would indicate an attendance of at least 12,000 or 15,000.

How does that compare with the institutions of learning in America during Colonial days when public schools were unknown? Is there not less illiteracy among the Filipinos to-day than there was among our ancestors then, when Great Britain was contending that they were not competent of self-government? Who does not know that the Filipinos to-day are far more literate and far more competent of self-government than the Cubans are and were when we granted them their independence?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSS. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I wonder by what principle, recognized in the American philosophy of government, it is supposed that a country can sell the sovereignty over other folks?

Mr. CROSS. No such doctrine can be applied if our principles are in keeping with our pretensions. We are supposed to stand for self-determination of peoples.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. What I mean is, How can you sell the right to govern people?

Mr. CROSS. It can not be done if justice be the guide.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROSS. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. I wish to say in answer to the gentleman from Texas, who has asked a very pertinent question, that the world has moved a great deal since 1898. We would not do to-day what we did in 1898. In other words, if Spain said they were going to sell the Philippines, we having destroyed Cavite and captured their forces, we would say, "Why, you have not got the Philippines to sell." We have moved a great deal since 1898, and that thing could not happen again and I do not believe it will happen again.

Mr. LOZIER. If the gentleman will permit, of course, the Members of the House are familiar with the provisions of the treaty of Paris, and as an evidence that this was not an absolute barter and sale, the treaty itself provides that the future government and political status of the Philippines shall be determined by Congress. The gentleman knows that President McKinley was opposed to taking the Philippines; that in his first instructions to the plenipotentiaries he told them he did not want the Philippines; then he finally consented that we should take the island of Luzon, but we finally took all of them, under a provision in the treaty that Congress should determine the future government and the political status of the Philippine people. It is a provision of the treaty. We did not buy the people.

The treaty itself recognized that they were not making an absolute sale of the sovereignty of those people, but they were handing over to Congress the right to determine what the political disposition should be.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield just for a minute, so I can make an observation?

Mr. CROSS. I yield.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. In reply to the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], is it not a fact, brought out by the gentleman from Missouri, that we did not buy the sovereignty over any people, but we did with the \$20,000,000 buy the title to the territory of the Philippine Islands?

Mr. LOZIER. We bought the rights of Spain, and Spain at that time did not have any rights.

Mr. CROSS. Is it the part of wisdom, are we worthy of the high trust imposed in us if we remain longer in these Asiatic waters dominated by a powerful, resentful, ambitious nation? But we are reminded by these profiteering propagandists, as well as by some well-meaning simple-minded folk of the Kellogg peace pact, and admonished that there are to be no more wars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DYER. I want the gentleman to have more time because he is making a fine speech on our duty to the people of the Philippines. I see the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs, present, and I want him to hear this speech, because it may help him to help us to get a chance to vote upon the question of Philippine independence.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. CROSS. But the nation that acts upon such a delusion is destined to destruction. It is not a new but an oft-dreamed dream, for at the end of each war, while remembering its horrors and still bearing its burdens, it seems "a consummation devoutly to be wished." History records a number of such attempts. At the close of the second Punic War, Rome and Carthage, then composing the civilized world, entered into a solemn treaty or peace pact that they would abolish and have no more war. And yet they had their sabers drawn again in less than 24 years. I fear the well-meaning entangling alliances entered into to bring about these visionary dreams, so far from accomplishing their purpose, will prove but incubators of war. Human nature never changes, and if there is one thing established by both divine and profane history, it is that wars are inevitable. Nations act on conditions and not on altruistic theories, and so acting we took this country from the Indians. Like bees, when a nation swarms with surplus population, if there is territory it can take, it will take, and altruism in conflict with that aim will melt like a wax image in a furnace. Such theories, my colleagues, are but the products of illogical minds that revel in iridescent clouds and constantly glimpse the coming of the millennium. They who would have their country to act upon such fancies would, unwittingly, have their country destroyed.

I beg of you, oh, my colleagues, to remember that duty is the sublimest word in any language. The eyes of the world are upon us. Let us not prove recreant to our high pretensions. To-day gratitude pleads and patriotism demands that we grant to these people their independence, entitled as they are to shape their own political destiny, "rough hew it as they may." [Applause.]

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the United States has been for some time a country with outlying possessions, it might be interesting to speak of some of them at this time. I want to speak particularly of the insular possessions under the care and guidance of the Navy Department. There are three of them—Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

SAMOA

I shall speak first of Samoa. The islands comprising American Samoa were acquired in 1900 and 1904 by cession from the high chiefs of the islands of Tutuila and Manua, and while we took possession at that time, the cession was not formally accepted by the United States until Congress passed a joint resolution on February 20, 1929, a little more than a year ago. By authority of this act a commission has been appointed by the President to make necessary recommendations to Congress regarding proper legislation for the islands. This commission is composed of two Senators, two Members of the House, and three Samoan chiefs. The commission is to meet some time this summer in Samoa.

The present governor of the islands is Captain Gatewood, and from all reports his troubles in governing Samoa are not so many nor so great as are experienced by the governors of some of our other possessions. In fact, the Samoan people are so easy to govern that the regulations issued by the governor have the same force as and are considered the law. In issuing these regulations the governor has the assistance of the native legislative body, called the Fono.

It is indeed interesting to a member of the Appropriations Committee to know that no direct appropriations annually are made by the Federal Government to help bear the expenses of the Samoan government. So far as is known, this can not be said of any other of our possessions. Much of the revenue that is raised for the local expense of the government of the islands is derived from a direct tax called the assess tax on males. Owing to the fact that the natives have not kept birth records, they never know just when a man reaches the age of 21 years, so they have adopted the plan of putting a tax on a male when he is 5 feet and 1 inch tall.

The Samoans are real Polynesians and said to be the finest specimens of the race. They are intensely religious. It is said that all Samoans are Christians, and, whether church members or not, nearly all go to church. It is a universal custom to have family prayers both morning and night in every Samoan home. I believe it will be conceded that this is a much better record than prevails in the United States. The Samoan

people are intelligent, amiable, very generous, and progressive. When I make the statement that the Samoans are a progressive people, it is meant in the true sense. I do not mean that they will talk progressive and then vote reactionary, like some so-called progressive statesmen do here in Washington.

One incident I shall relate to show what is meant by the statement that the Samoan people are progressive and want to advance even though it means more taxes on themselves: In building highways throughout the islands the natives found that it was necessary to have a steam shovel to cut away the rocks around the edge of the mountains. They had been trying for years to get this shovel, so the question was put up to their legislature, or rather, to their Fono. It seems that in a session of the Fono at a previous time they had proposed to create a sinking fund from their revenues to the amount of \$2,500 each year for the purpose of eventually buying the shovel. This process proved to be too slow for a progressive people, therefore, they appealed to the governor to permit them to buy it at once. The governor said no, for the reason that sufficient funds were not available, and he looked with disfavor on going into debt to buy the shovel. Not to be outdone, we are told that the Samoan chiefs held a consultation among themselves and voted in their assembly to raise the necessary funds by levying an additional tax of \$2.50 on each man, bringing the tax up to \$11.50 per year per man, in order to get their steam shovel at once. That is what I meant in saying that they are a progressive people. From my experience as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I believe that this is most unusual, for most people feel that the Federal Government, or Uncle Sam, should foot such bills, and, to be brutally frank about it, that disposition is not confined to the people of our insular possessions. I do not know of a place or a position that offers a better opportunity to ascertain just how liberal people are disposed to be with Uncle Sam's finances than as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

There is a continual urge to appropriate for this or that object, solely of local benefit, which, by no stretch of the imagination can be clothed with a Federal aspect.

As already stated, no direct appropriations are made by the Federal Government for the expenses of the island government. Indirectly, however, a great deal of the expense of the island government is borne from the Federal Treasury in that all of the executive officers of the government, such as superintendent of education, public-works officer, public-health and sanitation officer, customs officer, island treasurer, and all of the medical officers and naval nurses are members of the naval service and accordingly receive their pay from the Federal Government. The expense is borne by the Federal Treasury in connection with the pay of executive officers and the maintenance of hospitals and dispensaries throughout the islands; the maintenance of a station ship for communication between the islands; and the upkeep of housing facilities for the officers at the small naval station who are also the executive officers in the island government departments. This amounts to about \$475,000 yearly. The customs revenues from all sources last year amounted to \$73,923.30, so it can be seen that our sovereignty exacts an annual toll of about \$400,000.

The principal crop produced in the Samoan Islands is copra. This is the dried kernel of the ripe coconut, much of which is exported to foreign countries. Before we took over the islands the natives sold their surplus copra to traders at what was known as the "annual fono," or the general meeting of the delegates; but in 1903 the natives requested the United States Government to handle the entire copra export trade, with the result that the exports have been very materially increased, and also the native producers have received greater returns for their product.

It is interesting to know just how this business is handled by the Federal Government. The Government has an officer known as the secretary of native affairs, who sends out blank proposals in the early part of the season to copra buyers all over the world, calling for bids to be made for the entire copra crop of these islands intended for export. These bids are opened in the month of January, and the highest bidder is awarded the contract for that calendar year for the total output. These contracts have to be approved by the governor of the islands, and he sees that the producers get their money.

Samoa is a possession that came to us without any solicitation or even suggestion on our part. History reveals that on April 17, 1900, the high chiefs of these islands ceded them to the United States, as they deemed it to the interest and welfare of their people. They had to be protected from the greed of other nations and groups of selfish exploiters. The form of government for these islands, to say the least, is unique, but nevertheless entirely satisfactory both to the islanders and this Government. The governor, who is appointed by the President, is the head of the government. There are three administrative

districts in American Samoa. Each district is administered by a native district governor. These districts, like our own States, are divided into counties, and each county is administered by an hereditary chief. Each village is controlled by a village chief, and the city or village councils are composed of the heads of families. So it can be seen that the native Samoan has been permitted to retain his old form of government, which this Government very generously has not disturbed, making all concerned happy and contented.

GUAM

The island of Guam is another one of our insular possessions which is under the care and guidance of the Navy Department. In the government of this island is furnished another illustration of where, notwithstanding the fact that it is an American possession, and governed by a naval officer appointed by the President, the form of local government has been little interfered with and is conducted to a great degree under the Spanish law that existed in 1898 when this country took it over.

The natives, who number about 17,000, are known as Chamorras. The original Chamorras were Malays; but the present native is a mixture of Malay, Spanish, Filipinos, and whites. It is said, however, that the Malay predominates.

Guam is a very small island. It is about 30 miles in length, and from 4 to 8½ miles wide. It is said that the main occupation of the natives of Guam is agriculture, but to the extent only of supplying their wants. Practically the only crop of which there is an exportable surplus is copra. There was \$195,862 realized by the natives on their copra crop of 1928, which is not a bad showing when the small population and the further fact that there is only about 225 square miles in the island are considered.

The sick are cared for by the United States Government. For the fiscal year 1930, we appropriated \$22,000 for the care of the sick and the maintenance of lepers. All of the hospitals are operated by naval surgeons, as there are no native physicians or surgeons. We also appropriated \$13,000 for educational purposes and have 131 teachers, of whom 14 are Americans. The rest are natives.

Capt. William R. Furlong, of the Navy, directly in charge at Washington of matters pertaining to our insular possessions administered by the Navy, does not hesitate to say that notwithstanding the fact that the population of the island is increasing at the rate of from about 125 to 150 a year, the resources are such that they can be expanded to take care of the growing population.

The people of Guam have not had citizenship conferred upon them. The governors of this island for several years have recommended that citizenship be conferred, and Captain Furlong has indicated his opinion to be, from his knowledge of the feeling of these people toward the United States, that such citizenship should be granted. The present Governor of Guam made the following recommendation regarding the Guam people becoming citizens:

The greatest aspiration of the people of Guam is to become full-fledged citizens of the United States. Their present status is quite unsatisfactory, even the term "citizens of Guam" being almost meaningless at the present time, since there is no established system of acquiring citizenship in Guam and no law stating the exact requirements for such citizenship.

The governor contemplates setting forth by proclamation who are citizens of Guam and intends to promulgate a law permitting the naturalization of such aliens resident in Guam. These measures are essential in order to clarify the rights of property ownership, but they fall far short of local aspirations. Citizens of Guam now possess the privilege of freedom of entry and residence into the United States and the extension of citizenship, in the same manner as is done in Territories of the United States, would be a just and generous act.

Owing to the remoteness of Guam the inhabitants were not aware of the fact that there was war between the mother country, Spain, and the United States until June 20, 1898, at least two months after war had been declared. This information was given the Guam people by the cruiser *Charleston* when she steamed into the harbor and opened fire on Fort Santa Cruz. It was thought then that the *Charleston* was saluting the port, and the Spanish governor of the island was so informed by some of his officers. When, however, the true mission of the *Charleston* was revealed to the natives, many of them took to the bushes as they had been told by the Spanish that the Americans were savages, and that they could expect any kind of treatment at their hands except kindness.

The first American governor of Guam was Capt. Richard P. Leary of the United States Navy, who was appointed in the spring of 1899. It might be interesting to some of our wet friends in Congress to know that there was put in force by Captain Leary, prohibition order No. 1, which forbade the sale of

intoxicants to any person not a resident of this island prior to August 1, 1899. In other words, he began his house cleaning among his own garrison. Order No. 2 prohibited the importation of intoxicants except by special authority. If such usurpation of the liberties of the people should occur at this time, the wet champions like the gentleman from Milwaukee [Mr. SHAFER], and the gentleman from Baltimore [Mr. LINTHICUM], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], would have asked for his recall, denouncing him not only as a usurper but a tyrant of the worst type. That is not all Captain Leary did. In order to prevent a failure of food supplies, he ordered everyone without a trade to have "at least 12 hens, one sow," and to plant fruit or vegetables sufficient to provide for one family; and it did not make any difference whether he did or did not have a family.

All of Captain Leary's successors have been diligent in promulgating and putting into force good laws and regulations for the betterment of the native population, and have succeeded in bringing the natives up to a good, high level, morally, intellectually, and physically.

The present government of Guam is not unlike that of Samoa in that the governor is the only appointed and commissioned officer and the inhabitants are, in so far as civil status and political rights are concerned, under the Spanish laws which existed when we took possession of the island in 1899. Naturally these laws have been changed and modified to suit the conditions brought about by our ideas of local regulations. Congress has passed practically no legislation for Guam. It is said that neither the Constitution nor the laws of the United States have been extended to them, and that the only administrative authority existing in them is that derived from the President as the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. The highest court in the island is the Court of Appeals, consisting of three judges and a chief justice and two associates. There are also police courts and intermediate courts that take care of ordinary litigation and criminal matters. My understanding is that most, if not all, of these courts are presided over by a judge who is a native.

It seems strange that a Spanish-speaking people which inhabited Guam should change so quickly to an English-speaking people. It is said that only about 2 per cent of the population of Guam at this time can even understand Spanish. The language of the real native, of course, is Chamorro, which is one of the Polynesian tongues.

The revenues and expenses of the government of Guam for the past three or four years, are as follows: Beginning with the year 1927, the general revenues were \$128,215.16. To this amount should be added the sum of \$14,486.65, which constitutes certain profit derived from utilities, such as electric light, shop work, stevedoring, and so forth, supplied by the island government, and profits on certain investments which made a total receipt of \$142,701.81. The general expense was \$107,057.55, leaving a net balance of \$35,644.26. In the year 1928, the general revenues were \$126,117.63, and the profits from utilities, such as electric lights, and so forth, supplied by the island government, and profits from certain investments, made a total receipt of \$147,290.80. The general expense was \$128,140.53, leaving a net balance of \$19,150.27. The year 1929 shows that the general revenues were \$141,259.70, and added to this amount the profits from utilities, and so forth, amounting to \$26,516.49, made a grand total of receipts of \$167,776.19. The general expense was \$155,703.10, leaving a net balance of \$12,073.09. Of course, we have not the figures for 1930, so can give only the estimated receipts and expenses. It is estimated that the receipts for 1930 will be, for general revenues, \$141,000, to which will be added the profits heretofore mentioned, estimated to be \$19,000, making a total estimated receipts of \$160,000. The total general expense is estimated at \$181,355, which will leave a deficit of \$21,355.

The fact that there has been a very nice balance in former years and that there is an estimated deficit for the present year might call for a brief explanation. Now as to receipts, as has been said, in addition to the general revenues there have been certain profits such as derived from services which the island government furnishes to the population of Guam, such as electric lights. This is done because no concern or individual in the island is equipped financially to do it, so the expense in operating this plant is borne by the charges made on the people who are provided with this service, and the profits derived from this service are used in defraying the expenses of the island government.

The island government funds are invested in bonds and in the local island bank, and the interest derived from this investment is the other item of profit referred to a few moments ago. The reason assigned as to why the estimated profits for the year 1930 are much lower than the preceding years is because the principal formerly drawing interest has been used in the

building of schools, an administration building, and also other buildings, thereby depleting, to a very great extent, the principal which heretofore drew interest.

The increase in expenses, as estimated in 1930, is caused by several different things, such as increase in wages granted during the last administration, large amounts that have already been expended due to emergencies, and many thousands of dollars for public improvements necessary to be done this year.

Almost every native of the island owns a piece of land or has some rented from the Government. The report is that owing to the fertility of the soil and the climate, almost anything can be grown in Guam, and much more than would be necessary to supply home consumption if the native could be convinced that it would be to his interest to do so. Some of the crops that could be produced with profit besides copra are coffee of an excellent quality which grows all over the island, and which it is reported commands a good price; sugarcane, pineapples, also cotton of different varieties grows wild there. There are many kinds of fruit and vegetables produced on the island and do well. So it can be seen that there are great possibilities for this little island, notwithstanding the fact that it is so far away as to be almost isolated.

THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Virgin Islands of the United States comprise the islands of St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. John. These islands were purchased from Denmark for \$25,000,000 in 1917. In company with three other colleagues I visited these islands in March, 1929, and before I left was thoroughly convinced that Denmark drove a real bargain when she induced Uncle Sam to pay the sum of \$25,000,000 for them.

Owing to the fact that the islands form a natural outpost of the Panama Canal, and have been for more than a generation the important post of call for vessels plying between European countries and the canal, they were considered important. But more than any other reason was the fact that Germany was negotiating with Denmark for the islands so as to have a naval base in our own waters. This, of course, could not be permitted if within our power to prevent, and the only way to prevent it was to pay the fabulous price. This is one of our many war babies, or, probably better to say, war inheritances.

The United States attempted to purchase these islands on two different occasions long prior to 1917, and it is too bad we did not succeed, as it would have been less expensive at such times. During the Civil War it was deemed of great importance for the United States to have a naval station in the West Indies. It was thought then that if we had such a base that it would help to break the blockade running of the Confederate States. Nothing was done, however, until after the war was over, when Secretary of State Seward negotiated a treaty with Denmark for the purchase of two of the islands, namely, St. Thomas and St. John, for the sum of \$7,500,000; but the Senate of the United States refused to ratify it and it fell by the wayside. It took another war to make us realize that it was important for this country to have a naval base in the West Indies.

At the close of the Spanish-American War, or in January, 1902, we again took up the question of the purchase of the islands from Denmark. Another treaty was negotiated and the sum this time was \$5,000,000. This treaty was promptly ratified by the Senate of the United States and the lower House of Denmark, but failed to pass the upper House, therefore, it failed. Then another war, the World War, caused another negotiation for the purchase of the islands, which was successful, as already stated. History records the fact that in all probability we would have succeeded in the negotiations for the purchase in 1867 for the sum of \$7,500,000, but for the enmity existing between Senator Charles Sumner and President Andrew Johnson. Thus it can be seen how a little fuss between two statesmen cost the United States about \$17,500,000.

It might be interesting to relate just what was done on the part of the two Governments when the actual physical transfer was made. There was a short publication in the local papers notifying the inhabitants of the islands that the actual transfer was about to be made, as follows:

It is hereby brought to public notice that the formal delivery of the islands to the United States of America will take place this afternoon at 4 o'clock. The ceremony will be at the saluting battery.

Government of the Danish West India Islands, St. Thomas, the 31st day of March, 1917.

HENRI KONOW.
BAUMANN.

And thus the Danish West Indies passed into history and the Virgin Islands of the United States were born.

In my visit to the islands I talked with some of the old Danish residents who freely talked of these wonderful and impressive ceremonies; and while they are loyal to their

adopted country they still have a strong attachment for their dear old Denmark, and no one can blame them for entertaining that feeling.

Three members of the Appropriations Subcommittee, whose duty it is to look after appropriations for the Virgin Islands, went over there a little over a year ago to ascertain, if possible, if there could be some way suggested whereby these islands could be made at least somewhat self-supporting. We felt that it would not be necessary to appropriate, year after year, a quarter of a million dollars and more, to keep the people from want. As one member of that committee, I am compelled to admit that we found many problems that have to be met before the people of these islands can be self-supporting. When I say this I do not mean to convey the idea that the people do not want to do their part to bring about a better condition. It is because they are not in a position to do so; that is, there is nothing for them to do to better their condition.

When we took over the islands in 1917 the population was 26,000, which has decreased to less than 19,000 at this time. This is due to the fact that the younger people, who become educated, emigrate to the United States as soon as they finish school, for there is nothing for them to do on the islands. Speaking of education, I might say that owing to the fact that the natives are very poor, one would expect to see a great deal of illiteracy. Such is not the case.

The local law of the Virgin Islands provides that all children must attend school, beginning at 6 years of age and continuing until 15 years of age. Our committee visited several schools both in the city and country and found the children about as far advanced in their studies as children in corresponding grades in the States. Most of the teachers in these schools are natives and colored, and at least 98 per cent of the students are colored. This is in keeping with the population, which is about 92 per cent negro and the rest principally white. After those boys and girls are educated there is nothing for them to do in the islands and there is but one outlet, that of coming to the States.

The industries of the islands are limited. With the exception of agriculture (which is also limited) there are practically no industries. I do feel that if such industries as they have were developed to the fullest extent it would solve the question of how the people of the Virgin Islands could be made self-supporting. Take the main industry of sugar. It could be made a paying industry and would furnish employment for thousands who are not employed at this time. There is plenty of fertile soil and an abundance of sunshine to produce almost any vegetable that grows, like Bermuda onions, beans, tomatoes, and many other vegetables that are canned. All that is needed is water, which can be provided.

This, it is true, would call for an outlay of much money to provide reservoirs to catch the rainfall during the rainy season, but it would in the long run be less expensive to do this than to continue as we are, appropriating hundreds of thousands of dollars annually for the sole purpose of caring for a helpless people. The canning industry could be established and made a paying proposition. No finer tomatoes grow anywhere than can be found there. The same can be said of the sugar industry. The cattle industry is fair at this time and could be developed so as to be of some consequence if the States or present Government would find or provide a market for the cattle. The only market at this time is Porto Rico, which, of course, is not sufficient to care for an extensive cattle business. There is no question but that the bay-rum industry could be developed to such an extent as to make it the best anywhere in the world, but this can be done only by the Government taking hold and protecting the bay trees and providing up-to-date methods of preparing the bay rum and providing a market for the entire output. Anyone who will visit the island of St. John and see the primitive method in which bay oil is produced at this time will be impressed with the idea of what could be accomplished if the industry should be developed.

I have mentioned only a few of the things that, in my opinion, could and should be done for the people of these islands to make it possible for them to be self-supporting. Then if they do not cooperate when given a chance, for one I would be in favor of cutting them loose entirely. We have taken upon ourselves the burden, and I am in favor of doing something along industrial lines to develop the natural resources of those islands, even though it may cost a few hundred thousand dollars to do it, rather than to continue the course we are pursuing at this time of donating thousands of dollars annually in the way of appropriations, with no return and no prospect of it getting any better. I feel sure the people there are ready to cooperate if we will only make it possible for them to do so, but until we change this condition there is nothing to do except to continue appropriating.

It is a useless expense to continue to send commissions or committees to these islands to ascertain the cause or causes of these conditions. That matter has been gone into most thoroughly by no less than 10 commissions since we took possession. It might be well to name these commissions and the dates when each visited the islands.

In 1920 a joint commission of three members each from the Senate and the House of Representatives was directed to report on general conditions existing in the islands and possible need of change in the form of government.

Again in 1920 two special commissioners of the Treasury Department were appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury to investigate currency and banking conditions.

In 1924 a Federal commission of five members were appointed by the Secretary of Labor to investigate industrial and economic conditions.

Again in 1924 an irrigation engineer of the Reclamation Service was assigned by the Secretary of the Interior on request from the Secretary of the Navy to investigate irrigation possibilities on the island of St. Croix.

In 1925 the manager of the Porto Rico branch of the Federal Land Bank of Baltimore was requested by Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Dewey to survey the banking situation in the islands.

Again in 1925 an appointee of the Treasury Department was designated by a committee of the Treasury—appointed by the Secretary—to report on the financial and general economic situation.

Again in 1925 an appointee of the Treasury Department, designated by a committee of the Treasury—appointed by the Secretary—to report on the tax system.

In 1927 four members of the House Insular Committee made an unofficial visit to the islands at their own expense and held hearings there.

In 1928 an educational survey commission of four members was authorized by the Secretary of the Navy and conducted under the auspices of Hampton and Tuskegee Institutes.

In 1929 four members of the House Appropriations Committee visited the islands, accompanied by Capt. W. R. Furlong, United States Navy. They were BURTON L. FRENCH, WILLIAM B. OLIVER, WILLIAM A. AYRES, and GEORGE N. SEGER.

In addition to these numerous commissions, there was sent to the islands last year the Chief of the Bureau of Efficiency, Hon. Herbert D. Brown, with a sufficient staff to make a most thorough study of all of the problems existing there. He did this and filed an exhaustive report, pointing out these troublesome problems and suggesting many remedies that would no doubt be helpful. After seeing for myself, and also reading Mr. Brown's report, I have reached the conclusion that the only way to accomplish anything beneficial, both to the Virgin Islands and to the Federal Government, would be to appropriate a sum sufficient to put into execution many of the projects Mr. Brown suggests, and that he be charged with the responsibility of seeing that these projects are carried out. The Federal Government can well afford to provide a sufficient amount for this purpose as a matter of economy, otherwise it means a continued annual appropriation of anywhere from \$250,000 to \$350,000 simply to care for these people.

The appropriation for the fiscal year 1930 was \$314,000. This year the Budget estimate calls for \$275,000, \$10,000 of which may be expended for public wells. It is estimated that the expense of the islands for 1931 will be \$560,412.80, and that the revenues from all sources will be \$269,212.80, leaving a deficit of \$291,200. This is in Danish West Indian money, and amounts to \$280,000 in United States currency. The revenues are approximately \$50,000 less than collected in 1929. The United States expenses, such, for instance, as the expense of the central administration of all of the islands, amounting to \$68,629.77 in 1930, and estimated to be the same in 1931, are taken out of the appropriation made by us, and the balance is turned over to the two colonial council treasuries, which would be in the neighborhood of \$200,000.

When our committee was in the islands about a year ago, some islander called our attention to the fact that the Virgin Islands were purchased by the United States and then forgotten. He, of course, did not know that we knew that within the 14 years we had been caring for them we had expended more than the Danish Government had expended in over 200 or 250 years of occupancy. This illustrates the old saying that the more you do for some people the more they expect you to do, and if you do not do it, you may expect to hear complaints. I am glad to say that the complaint of that individual was not general. I feel that most of the islanders are more than pleased with the change and can be made happier by making it possible for them to help themselves.

Whatever is done, however, to bring about this condition should be done before most of the people reach the conclusion

that it is the duty of the United States Government to feed them, care for them in hospitals, and finally bear the expense of placing them in their final resting place. There are too many of that mind at this time and the sentiment is growing. I want to emphasize the fact that the only thing this Government should think of doing is to make it possible for these people to be self-supporting, and when that is accomplished, make them realize that it is up to them to work out their own salvation. The sooner this is done the better it will be for the Federal Government, and it certainly will be better for the people of the Virgin Islands.

It is unfortunate, to say the least, that some are prone to make reckless statements regarding our attitude toward the Virgin Islands. I am not concerned about statements like the one made by an islander to which I referred a moment ago, that the United States had bought the islands and then forgotten them. I do feel, however, that statements made by Members of either branch of Congress, touching our government of these islands, should set forth the facts. I remember last winter when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYLE] made a speech which is recorded on pages 708 and 709 of the *RECORD* of December 14. He said:

We have eliminated an industry there in the manufacture of rum and bay rum, which was a big industry on the islands. Right or wrong, that fact remains.

I do not know just where the gentleman from Pennsylvania got his information regarding this matter, as well as some other questions relating to the Virgin Islands which he discussed at that time. I do know, however, that if he had informed himself he certainly would not have made the statement he did concerning the industry of bay rum. Statistics show that from 1909 up to the time we took over the islands in 1917 that the number of gallons of bay rum sold and exported averaged from 16,000 to 20,000 gallons annually. It also shows that in the year 1919, after we had taken over the islands, the number of gallons sold and exported was 52,519.

The number of gallons of bay rum sold and exported annually from the years 1918-1919, up to the present, is as follows: In 1920, 89,105 gallons; in 1921, 79,415 gallons; in 1922, 73,859 gallons; in 1923, 65,524 gallons; in 1924, 74,574 gallons; in 1925, 79,730 gallons; in 1926, 85,148 gallons; in 1927, 74,277 gallons; in 1928, 91,628 gallons, and in 1929, 91,116 gallons. If the bay-rum industry has been eliminated by the United States to any extent, as stated, it seems strange that it should be by increasing the number of gallons sold and exported from about 20,000 to over 91,000 gallons annually.

Our committee, when over in the islands a year ago, heard a few complaints of this nature, but when faced with the actual facts the complaining party usually admitted that it might be somewhat different than he stated. I know, personally, that the people of the Virgin Islands are far better satisfied at this time than they were under Danish rule. It is true that there are a few, but only a few, in the islands who would not be satisfied with anything short of being allowed to rule absolutely the island and the people.

In conclusion I want to state that the people of the islands of Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands are happy under the government afforded them by the United States through the Navy Department; but notwithstanding that fact, there is a move on foot at this time to transfer these island governments from the Navy Department to the State or some other department.

I venture the opinion that if the people of these islands could be consulted and their desires regarding this matter be obtained, that not 10 per cent of the inhabitants of the Virgin Islands would favor the transfer, not to exceed 5 per cent of the people of Guam would favor it, and not even 1 per cent of the people of Samoa would favor it.

Then, who is it that is so interested in this contemplated transfer of these island governments from the Navy Department to some other department, and why is it necessary? No good reason has been assigned for such a transfer and none can be given.

The governments in all three of these islands are as near perfect as it is possible to have a government of one people by another, and the people in all of these islands are as happy as it is possible for a government to make them happy and contented. Then the proposed transfer can not be for the reason that the governed people of these islands are not satisfied. The Navy Department is willing to continue governing these islands as it has in the past, so the desire to transfer does not emanate from that source. The real reason may never be known, but it will be contended no doubt that it is a question of economy. That reason and argument can be exploded without even an effort. It is a well-known fact that the governing organization in each of these islands is composed largely of Navy personnel,

already on the pay roll of Uncle Sam, and while this personnel could be used for other purposes in connection with the Navy, it is also a well-known fact that the Navy is getting along without the services of these men.

It is also a well-known fact that many of these officers and men who constitute the governing body of these islands could command anywhere from twice to three times as much salary for similar services in civil life. This is true as to all, but more especially the physicians and surgeons, who are giving their very best in these island hospitals. Not only this, but there is much more I might recite along this line.

I want now to call attention to the added fact that the governors and personnel, generally speaking, being Navy personnel, are independent of political parties and political influence. I feel that one of the reasons, if not the impelling reason, for demanding this transfer from the Navy to some other department is because certain designing individuals in these islands or elsewhere know that so long as the Navy Department, free from political influence, has control of these islands, there will be no opportunity to exploit them. I know, personally, that the Navy, while willing to continue to govern these islands, would not oppose being relieved of this service, that the department is not asking that it be allowed to continue governing these islands, but that it will continue to do it, and do it well, as long as the duty is assigned to it.

To make a transfer to another department of Government means to create a new, large, and expensive organization in some bureau here in Washington, and also a new and expensive organization in each of these islands, with the organization in both instances composed of political office or job hunters and controlled by party politics. When this occurs, if it ever does, then prepare for real expenditures of Government funds in those islands, and God help the natives, for exploitation in all probability will be the chief business conducted in all three of these island possessions. For one, I am opposed to such a move and shall continue my opposition so long as I am a Member of Congress. I believe in letting well enough alone. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SPROUL].

Mr. SPROUL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I wish to make a few remarks upon the subject of the protective tariff, a very old subject.

We are taught, we unsophisticated people in the midwestern part of our country, that the purpose of the imposition of protective tariff duties on products brought into our country from foreign countries is to protect the industries within our own country against cheap foreign labor and to encourage the production within our own country of sufficient products to supply the needs of our people, and also to secure better prices for the producers of our products.

Are we right about these purposes or are we wrong? Just why do we impose duties on imported products? From an academic standpoint what are the specific purposes and what is to be gained by imposing duties on imported products?

Primarily, we are told here on the floor of this House that it is to protect the capital invested in industry; it is to protect the labor employed in industry against cheap foreign labor; to keep labor employed and to keep capital employed to the end that the industries of our own country may supply all the needs of our people. At no time are we concerned about the duties that are going to be paid by importers. We give no thought to this question. Nobody thinks anything about how much duty is going to be raised from imports. The duties that will be paid by the importers receive no thought from any of us and no attention is paid to them by anyone. But the sole consideration is to protect industry and labor. But we know that duties will be paid. We know that goods from foreign countries will come into our country over the tariff wall. We know from experience that this will be done and the question then is that we ought to think about who is going to pay these duties. Who will pay these duties ultimately?

Up in Massachusetts these duties are to protect the manufacturer of shoes. We have heard a lot about it from both sides of the Chamber. They are put there to protect industry—that is, the manufacturers of shoes—and to keep capital and labor employed; but who is going to pay the extra price on the shoes that the duty will be put on when the shoes come over the tariff wall and are sold to our people? It will be the consumers that will pay, the persons who buy and use them. And so it will be on sugar and on every commodity on which an import duty is placed.

Now, if all of the people in our country who use imported goods pay in excess of what they otherwise would have paid, a price to enable the importer to pay his duties, they indirectly have paid the duty themselves. So our own people really pay

indirectly all the revenue collected as import duties. It is an inexorable truth that when we buy the imported goods on which there is a duty we who buy and use pay all the duty, which now amounts to between \$500,000,000 and \$600,000,000 annually; and not only is this true, but we generally pay a much higher price for all the articles protected by the duties or imposts we pay.

If our protective-tariff system does not protect each and every industry equally with every other industry it is faulty.

For years and years \$600,000,000 annually goes into the Treasury from imports, and it means that the people of this country have paid the \$600,000,000 in excess prices for the products that they buy, besides higher prices for similar articles to those on which the duties have been imposed.

Where, then, is there any wrong; where, then, is there any inequity in an export and import debenture certificate being provided for? Wheat producers are entitled to a tariff protection that would enable them to receive 25 cents better price per bushel. The 150,000,000 bushels of Kansas wheat should bring to the State at least \$35,000,000 more each year, if the tariff on wheat was effective. But our people do not get it, although they pay their share of our import duties, and also higher prices on all articles coming into competition with goods on which duties have been levied.

We hear about the effect of a high duty on manufactured watches and jewelry that come to our country and have been coming from Switzerland. You know we propose to put a high duty on those articles and to keep them out. We propose to destroy that country's market. Suppose that Switzerland, now buying products from us, retaliates and forbids the receipt of our goods into their country, that which we have been exporting there. Have we done ourselves a wrong? Have we done ourselves an injury? There is not a particle of difference in the ultimate effect between the placing of a high foreign duty on the imported manufactured goods on the one hand and thereby destroying a market for such goods, and on the other hand placing an export duty upon the products of this country so that they may successfully compete with similar goods of the foreign country.

I want to say to the Members of this House that I hope the Senate will stand firm upon their contention for an export debenture upon wheat and cotton, and never yield as long as time lasts. I hope there will be no compromise, because they are standing for what is equitable, what is academically right, and what is morally right. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, for the information of Members of the House, I suggest that we begin reading the bill and rise upon the conclusion of the reading of the first paragraph.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this naval appropriation bill and shall be glad to vote for it. It is a part of the national defense and I suppose the most important factor in it. There are other factors, such as a proper Military Establishment; that is, an Army in the fullest and widest significance of the word, an Army that will embrace both the Regular Establishment, State National Guard, and the reserves, which are reasonably well taken care of by the Nation to-day. Flood control is a factor which will not only prevent an enormous wastage in property, as that word is usually understood—that is, in houses, farms, and cattle that are lost through annual inundations—but which will also prevent that other terrific wastage, which is the gravest concern of those who are living for their country not to-day only but who believe it their mission also to prepare it and maintain it in full force and vigor for the generations to come, and that is the wastage of the top soil that is being carried from the most fertile parts of the Mississippi Valley by the flood waters of the lordly Mississippi and its tributaries down to the Gulf of Mexico annually to such an enormous extent that it takes more than 1 cubic mile of that which on America should live during the coming years. Our highways must also be our concern and their development and extension to all parts of the United States is just as important for the national welfare as a properly conducted and maintained railroad system is for our national defense. As a matter of fact, the Navy, the first line of defense, the Army, the second line, backed up and supported by a transportation system composed of railways, highways, waterways, and airways so coordinated as to make for the cooperative movement that will spell for success and triumph in peace and in war time.

For, Mr. Chairman, there is no use in blinding our eyes to the facts of human existence. There is no use in ignoring the facts taught by the pages of history. This world is a world bot-

tommed upon force; that is the fundamental law of life. We see it in operation in every phase of existence, animate and even inanimate. We can not afford to ignore the truths that are apparent to all who read and understand the reason for the growth of republics, kingdoms, and empires. The growth in each case is the result of application of force. Though we may preach of the benevolent manner in which we have grown to the tremendous extent that has marked our progress, one need not be a cynic to recognize that we sprang from nothing, for the first comers and the early comers from Europe to America did not own an inch of ground on the Western Hemisphere.

By the strong arm of might they took all that we have; first, from the Indians and then by slave labor, advancing agriculturally; and then by purchases, such as the Louisiana Purchase, not altogether free from moral suspicion and doubt; and then territory gained as a result of the war against Mexico and, subsequently, more territory gained by our conquest of Spain; so that we are to-day great, grand, and wonderful. Our flag floats in eastern seas, under the Southern Cross, and under Northern Lights in the far-away Frigid Zone, and though it is our pride and it is with a thrill of martial glory that we say to ourselves and to the world as individuals and as a people, "I thank God I, too, am an American," the realization is ever present in the mind of him who understands and does not blur the facts that the America of which he is so proud is the America of the mailed arm and the steel fist. And our country has but trod in the path of every other country that attained opulence and glory. We won the heights and they won the heights by adhering to the law and recognizing that force is the sine qua non to progress, development, and stability. Rome grew through her legions and her triremes. England, the heart and soul of Great Britain, has grown through her navy first, and her army. And she has never hesitated or scrupled when the necessities of the hour demanded ruthlessness as the price for expansion and power. So, too, with all of the other empires that have played out their part in the grand drama of life and then disappeared when they forgot the law by which they did grow and expand.

It is not swashbuckling to say that kingdom by blood gained must be by blood maintained. It is merely the restatement of a truth as old as the human race is upon this earth. In the course of time Britain and our own Republic will pass away and be forgotten. Countries, like individuals, are born, they live, and pass away and in time are buried beneath oblivion's waves. But it is our duty as Americans to do all that we can in our lifetime to extend the years of our country.

We should endeavor to so live our lives that the Republic will be stronger, greater, nobler, and more powerful on the day when we go westward forever than on the day we fell into the life of the country through the miracle of birth. And we should not blind our eyes to the truths that are made self-evident by the fact of human existence. There is every reason in the world why Great Britain and the United States should be and remain friends forever. But the American that would carry that belief and that hope to such an extent as to imperil the position of his own country would be unwise, indeed. Beware of the seeming friend of to-day, because he may be the enemy of to-morrow. While related to England by ties of blood, which should make for almost fraternal understanding, we know what Great Britain did to the colonists when that blood tie was even stronger than it is to-day. We know what Great Britain did to the struggling States in the War of 1812. We know what England was willing to do during our Civil War, and though we saved her from annihilation during the World War let no American believe for a single moment that England would hesitate to subordinate us to her in the scheme of world affairs, of which she desires to remain the principal factor. I do not mention these historical facts acrimoniously, because I have in a measure a great admiration for a country that has grown so great that the sun never sets on her possessions and whose drum beats are heard daily the world around. I view her apparent oppressions of tyranny and even the atrocities she has committed with a somewhat charitable eye because I know that all other countries in their growth have been the victims of that inexorable law to which I have referred and the perpetrators of many crimes. Her unspeakable attitude for centuries to a people who numbered among them my own ancestors is a blot upon her glory which she can never extinguish or obliterate. And the infamous treatment of that English-speaking people apparently was dealt out to them in hopes of degrading them to a point where they could neither understand nor ever even hope for liberty and freedom. And this notwithstanding that the Irish and the English people are very closely related in blood, which is evidenced by the fact that they speak the same tongue.

For to use a good expressive American word, much of this Anglo-Saxon Celtic talk is unadulterated bunk, and used only

for the purpose of creating a difference in the people of the British Isles. In my own lifetime I can remember when Liverpool, Birmingham and Manchester were almost as Irish as Boston is to-day, and the Irish have contributed to the growth of London almost as largely as many parts of England itself, and so has Scotland and Wales in a measure used their blood with that of England. It is not only the north of Ireland that has felt the influence of English and Scotch blood. English and Scotch for centuries have been crossing into Ireland and marrying there, and millions of Irish have gone into England and married there. The point is that England has not hesitated to deal as monstrously with her own blood, which the Irish people are when the circumstances and conditions required as she dealt with China and India. There were times when that tyrannical misrule cried aloud to heaven for vengeance. I merely mention these facts as one looking on at the drama and tragedy of life as played by nations, and without any acrimony, because I know that all of the acts were apparently decreed by fate, and were inescapable. Because true indeed it is that God moves in mysterious ways His wonders to perform. And one of those wonders to us should be to forever remain mindful that we must be prepared for the day when it will become the interest of some great power or many powers to reduce us in order that they might expand accordingly and grow rich in proportion as it or they may make us to shrink and shrivel. There is no reason in the world why Great Britain should ever assail us except one, and that is sufficient to justify her in endeavoring to put us down to a second-rate position, either by her own force or by sacking on some other power or powers to do the job for her.

She would not want to see us destroyed, but it might be to her interest to see us reduced so that we might be compelled to play the part of colonists again. So let us be prepared, Mr. Chairman, from every standpoint. Let us fight the good fight from day to day and discharge our duty to our country by keeping her prepared and with that Navy and Army and transportation system essential to the permanency of the Republic. Let us study new methods and devise a Navy that will be powerful enough to protect America's greatness and her grandeur and her glory, which mean the wonderful civilization we have built up from swamp and wilderness. Let us keep our eyes open to the wonderful developments that are being made daily in submarines and aircraft, and do not let us forget that other countries would like to abolish submarines because they are the sea enemies which those countries have reasons to most fear. Let us not forget that the very fact that other countries would abolish them as instrumentalities of war is what should make us study their development with greater care and intensity. Let us hope, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that wars are very remote; let us hope, indeed, that they shall never come again. For hoping very frequently produces a psychological effect and brings about that which is wished for. A proper mental attitude has a mighty influence in developing, even though it may not destroy or eradicate laws that are inseparably associated with life itself. Let us remain true to our country, though that advice is not necessary to the American people from whose hearts and heads comes the noble utterance:

Our country, may she live forever and a day, but if she must die let it not be from internal dissension and decay but upon a battle field of imperishable glory.

As a contributing thought to the problem of flood control let me submit the views of a man who has devoted the best years of his life to the study of the Mississippi River and the blessings it has bestowed upon the people of the valley as well as to the havoc it has wreaked upon a people who have been unmindful of their duty to properly harness the watery steed and make it the useful servant which it should be at all times to the millions that dwell behind its levees. If on the anvil of discussion the spark of truth should fly I should know the truth about the lordly river and its tributaries for I have discussed the old river with many of the notables who know its history, its songs, and its rampages. The lamented Robert Downman, Marshal Ballard, James M. Thomson, James Edmonds, Walter Parker, George Maxwell, and my friend Thomas T. Barr have favored me with their views and ripened my own thought upon a subject that is as thrilling and attractive as it is disquieting to those who want and pray to see the valley blossom as the rose, which it will when flood control is absolutely and beyond all controversial assurance. For what it is worth read a paper prepared for me by one who is too modest to have me mention his name, who labors without hope of reward or fear of punishment, confident that the reward of one duty well performed is the power to perform and discharge another. He has labored for his country in order to gain that knowledge which will enable him to labor still more industriously for it—for he loves his country and scorns to give aught other reason why.

FLOOD PROTECTION FOR THE VALLEY

"Charity begins at home."

"Self-preservation is the first law of nature."

Congress has provided for immediate flood protection for New Orleans.

That purpose of Congress should be accomplished without delay.

After two years of waiting it remains unaccomplished.

Everything Congress needed to do to give safety to New Orleans has been done.

The purpose of Congress was clear and plain.

There was no misunderstanding about it.

With reference to that one matter, the safety of New Orleans, no further action by Congress is necessary.

The purpose of my remarks is not criticism.

No fault is intended to be found with the Army engineers.

Yet the fact remains that our fate is in their hands.

The responsibility rests with them, and to them our appeal must be made for quick action which will make it unnecessary to ever again blow up a levee to protect New Orleans from a flood calamity.

The interests of New Orleans are more than local—they are national.

A serious flood catastrophe at New Orleans would be a national calamity.

New Orleans is a great national port for our world commerce.

The city is fast becoming one of the great maritime cities of the world.

Its seagoing commerce serves more than half the territory of the United States of America, and probably more than four-fifths of its population, and contributes to the general prosperity of all its people.

The tremendous national benefit accruing from this steady enlargement of our national trade with the whole world through the port of New Orleans is fully appreciated and recognized by Congress, as evidenced by the steady continuance of large appropriations for improved waterways and canals connecting with or radiating from New Orleans.

Whatever danger now threatens it from floods arises, not from national policies originating with Congress but originating with the Mississippi River Commission or the Army engineers, which have been radically modified by Congress.

The ever-rising flood level has resulted from the national policy of higher and higher levees, which did not originate with Congress, and Congress has now vested in the Army engineers full authority to establish at New Orleans a safe maximum flood level by building a spillway.

That action was taken by Congress in May, 1928—two years ago—yet we still have no spillway.

The people would have been content with "any port in a storm," and would to-day be content with any spillway devised by the Army engineers. And if any modification of the Army engineer plan for the Bonnet Carre spillway would expedite construction, it would seem as though such modification should be made without delay by the Army engineers.

Not as a suggestion as to what the Army engineers should do but merely to illustrate this point: The broad-shallow spillway plan adopted by the Army engineers requires a broad strip of land between the Mississippi River and Lake Pontchartrain for the flood waters to flow across. This broad-shallow spillway has been objected to by engineers of note, who urge a plan for a narrow-deep spillway which would require much less land for flowage and cost less by many millions than the broad-shallow spillway. One cause of delay in construction has been the acquisition of the broad strip of land required for flowage under the broad-shallow spillway plan of the Army engineers. The question is whether that controversy might be largely eliminated by the adoption of the narrow-deep spillway.

Among those who believe the narrow-deep spillway plan should be adopted are Mr. A. B. B. Harris, consulting engineer, of Chicago, and of 2905 Chamberlayne Avenue, Richmond, Va., and John R. Freeman, of Providence, R. I. The opinions of such engineers must carry weight and merit thoughtful consideration. In an article in the Engineering News Record, page 818, November 21, 1929, Mr. Harris contends:

The total cost of constructing the narrow spillway with its necessary waylands (1,500 acres), guard levees, bridges, etc., will be but little, if any, more than one-third the cost of constructing the broad spillway with its necessary waylands of 7,500 acres. The saving in construction cost will be not less than \$10,000,000. In addition to this large saving in construction cost the cost of operation and maintenance will also be greatly reduced.

In the same issue of the Engineering News Record there is an article by Prof. W. B. Gregory, consulting engineer, of New Orleans, which questions the location and design of the Army engineer plan for a broad, shallow spillway.

As the award of the commission created to appraise the value of lands to be included in the broad, shallow spillway has been set aside, the question presents itself whether the work might not in the end be expedited by reducing the area required for the spillway by 6,000 acres so as to be forced to acquire only 1,500 acres for the deep, narrow spillway instead of 7,500 acres for the broad, shallow spillway.

The point that I want to make clear is that it seems to me beyond question that the safety of New Orleans, and the immediate removal of the flood menace from its commerce and industries, is the question of first importance, and the necessity for quick action should take precedence over all controversial matters of opinion just as much as if works of defense were being built by the National Government with a view to preventing an attack being made on New Orleans and the city devastated in a war with some foreign nation.

When we come to the fighting of floods, we are fighting a great battle against nature's devastating forces which should be fought with the same grim determination to let nothing stand in the way of victory as we would put forth in a battle against war's devastating forces.

FLOWAGE RIGHTS FOR FLOOD WAYS FROM ARKANSAS TO THE GULF

We are confronted by other questions of greater magnitude than those involved in the Bonnet Carre Spillway project, when we look at the problem of flood protection for New Orleans from a broader point of view.

Chief among these is the cost of flowage rights for the flood ways proposed by the so-called Jadwin, or Army engineer plan, approved by Congress when the flood control bill became a law on May 15, 1928. An appeal to the courts has practically suspended construction of these flood ways until these flowage rights have been acquired. No satisfactory estimate has been made of their cost, but it may turn out to be prohibitive, and it may finally force flood storage on the tributaries as substitute for the flood ways, because if the waters are held back on the tributaries beneficial uses may be made of them, which will offset in large part the costs of construction. The flood ways are purely defensive in their nature, and permit of no use of the flood waters for beneficial purposes to offset construction costs.

Therefore, it seems inevitable that before the flood ways are built the possibilities of returns from beneficial use of flood waters held back on the tributaries will be thoroughly investigated and studied, and all who want flood safety in the lower valley should take counsel among themselves to avoid being drifted into an attitude of local selfishness that might arouse the antagonism of the people of the tributaries, where local floods have done terrible damage, as in Oklahoma and Kansas and the Ohio Valley. We of New Orleans especially should recognize that we need, and must deserve, the good will, on this flood question, of every community on the great watershed that pours its products through our gateway to the oceans of the world as part of our national world commerce.

With that end in view I have for several sessions of Congress introduced at each session a bill which provides a complete plan for working out this great problem of utilizing the flood waters on the tributaries for beneficial uses that will create values so great that they will largely offset construction costs—not with the idea of pushing the bill but in order that we may have before us a well-digested measure as a basis for study by the individual Members of Congress when that vitally important question is reached.

To illustrate the relation of source stream control to the floods that menace the country below Cairo let us briefly examine that project as an alternative to the flood way from Arkansas to the Gulf, on which work has now been suspended because of the immense cost of the necessary flowage rights.

The flood flow that must be taken care of at Old River in a flood like that of 1927 is 3,000,000 second-feet, approximately. Of that only about 2,000,000 second-feet can be taken down the main Mississippi River and the Atchafalaya, leaving 1,000,000 second-feet with no place to go unless it breaks the levees and runs wild over the plantations and ruins cities, towns, and thriving communities as it forces its way to the Gulf, just as it did in 1927.

Now, that 1,000,000 second-feet of surplus flood with no place to go can be taken care of by the source stream control plan in this way:

First. Reduce the total flood-peak flow at Old River by providing for the beneficial use of the waters of the Red River watershed in such a way as to prevent any flood flow whatever from the Red River from ever reaching the Mississippi River at Old River. That would take care of 250,000 second-feet, or one-quarter of the surplus 1,000,000.

Second. That leaves only 750,000 second-feet to be taken care of, and 400,000 of that can be held back by storage on the water-

shed of the Arkansas River so that it would not reach the Mississippi until long after all danger of floods had passed. That leaves only 350,000 second-feet remaining of the original 1,000,000 second-feet of surplus flood flow at Old River.

Third. Much more than that 350,000 second-feet can be held back on the upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio Rivers, with their tributaries, on the authority of eminent engineers whose opinions can not be whistled down the wind by any "doubting Thomas."

That takes care of the whole 1,000,000 second-feet of surplus flood at Old River, and would reduce a flood of 3,000,000 (just such a flood as 1927) to 2,000,000 second-feet. If that reduction had been made in 1927 the damages from that flood would not have occurred.

This whole plan for the elimination of the floods of the Red River from Mississippi River floods may be subdivided into five projects for the ultimate beneficial use of the flood waters:

(a) The project for flood storage reservoirs in Oklahoma as fully outlined to the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives by Mr. E. E. Blake of Oklahoma City, at its hearings in 1927-28, and again quite recently.

(b) The supplemental project explained by Doctor Achison in his recent statement before the House Flood Control Committee, for a very large reservoir in the Red River near Denison, Tex., from which the waters could be diverted through a cut to the Trinity River in Texas, and into other Texas rivers, so as to be carried south to territory where the waters are greatly needed, for beneficial uses, or will be in the near future.

(c) The project suggested by Col. Robert Bradford Marshall, for many years Chief Geographer of the United States Geological Survey at Washington, D. C., for diverting flood waters near Shreveport, which could be held back in storage between Denison and Shreveport, into the Sabine River, and thence down that river to the Gulf of Mexico.

(d) The project of Wellman Bradford for a comprehensive canal system to furnish water for the rice fields of Louisiana by diversion in the neighborhood of Natchitoches, and storage below until needed, for that beneficial use in the rice fields. The demand on the fresh-water bayous for water for the rice fields is so great that it sometimes reverses the flow and the salt water gets to the pumps, doing great harm. A stable unlimited supply of fresh water would be of enormous value to this great industry of Louisiana and Texas.

(e) The fag end of any Red River flood that might have fallen too low down in Arkansas or Louisiana to have been taken care of under the four projects above enumerated could be diverted through a flood-water canal from Egg Bend to Vermilion Bay, as indicated on the map facing page 4172 of part 6, Hearings before Flood Control Committee, House of Representatives, on January 27, 1928.

Under this complete plan for standardizing the flow of the Red River and eliminating its floods for beneficial use in Oklahoma, Texas, and Louisiana, the stage required for the navigation of the Red River to the Denison Dam would be standardized and maintained throughout the year. Only the flood waters would be stored and diverted for other beneficial uses than navigation.

It is not proposed that the flood storage works on the tributaries as above described shall be delayed until the waters are actually needed for beneficial use. What is proposed is that the Government should build the works under carefully worked-out plans that would ultimately provide for the beneficial use of all the stored waters under some plan that would absorb the waters in such a way that the Government could make a charge for their use and thereby create an asset of permanent value to it, instead of expending millions or possibly billions of dollars ultimately without creating anything of value in return except defense against devastation by floods.

The plan for flood storage on the Arkansas River in Oklahoma, as was suggested by Mr. Blake, could be extended on down to Little Rock, and thereby all flood damage on that river entirely obviated in the future, besides taking care of 400,000 second-feet of flood waters that would otherwise force their way through to the Mississippi as they did in 1927.

All the details of this Arkansas River project were so fully explained by Mr. Blake to the Flood-Control Committee at its recent hearings that it need not be repeated here. I have gone into the projects for taking care of the Red River with more detail, because the plans for the beneficial use of the flood waters of the Red River in Louisiana to supply fresh water to the rice fields are of great immediate importance to that industry at this present time.

As to reducing the flood at Cairo 350,000 second-feet by flood-water storage on the watersheds of the three great rivers that bring them down to Cairo, the upper Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio, there would seem to be no possible doubt of the fact

that they can be so held back on those watersheds, and all the waters so held back used for beneficial purposes in that territory.

General Hiram M. Chittenden, of the Army Engineer Corps, in his report on reservoirs, made in 1897, 33 years ago, gave it as his opinion, that on the whole watershed of the Mississippi River above Cairo, one-fifth of the maximum of a flood like 1897 could be taken off at Cairo.

Lyman E. Cooley, one of our greatest American hydraulic engineers, estimated that with 50 or 60 per cent of the watershed under control, a reduction could be made at Cairo of 500,000 to 600,000 second-feet. So it seems to be beyond question that the floods at Cairo, and at Old River, could be brought within safe limits, and all future flood catastrophes avoided, by the control of the waters on the tributary watersheds, if we avail ourselves of the great values that may be created by the ultimate beneficial uses of the water to offset the costs of construction of the necessary works for its control and conservation.

The success of this whole project depends on the adoption of a plan such as is embodied in the bill I have already referred to, which in this session is H. R. 9848, introduced by me on February 13, 1930, which creates a permanent coordinating commission to work out all details and apportion benefits and costs between the various interested and benefited agencies, including the Nation, the States, municipalities, districts, and all local agencies.

When President Wilson was President, a similar bill, known as the Newlands bill, was before Congress, and President Wilson created a Cabinet commission to report on it. That Cabinet commission appointed a committee of the bureau and service chiefs to study and report on the bill. They devoted several months to it, and finally reported a plan which was embodied in the final Newlands bill, as printed in full with the hearings thereon, in Senate Document No. 550, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session. That bill was S. 5736, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session.

The plan proposed by that interdepartmental committee created a commission composed of the Secretaries of War, Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce, with the President of the United States as chairman. The necessity for a board giving all its time to this most important and complicated subject was recognized and provided for through the creation of a subordinate water control board, composed of a chairman appointed by the commission and a "technical aide" or "highly qualified representative" appointed by each of the Secretaries of the four departments named. This plan, it will be observed, obviates the objections to an independent commission, and would put all four of the great departments of the Government having to do with water problems at work under a coordinating plan, each receiving equal recognition, so they would all be enlisted in an effort to adopt all practicable methods for flood control and water conservation.

In the preparation of my bill I have retained this plan for a commission composed of the four Secretaries, but have provided for the appointment of a chairman by the President, who should also be the chairman of the water-control board. In that way we would secure the greatest efficiency, I believe. Each of the four Secretaries would appoint a representative on the water-control board, as originally recommended by the interdepartmental committee, as I have already explained.

Another plan is adopted in my bill that has been tried very thoroughly in the case of the Appalachian National Forest act. A member of the Senate and a Member of the House, ex officio, are made members of the commission. This plan has worked so well in the case of the Appalachian Commission that I believe it will commend itself to adoption as a part of the machinery which must be provided before we can expect to get any final right results out of this maze of complications that now involve the flood-control problem.

I have grave doubts whether we will ever be able to put through any plan that will effectively put an end to the flood menace in the lower Mississippi Valley until we have provided the machinery for utilizing the flood waters as a great national asset to offset costs of construction. That is what my bill is designed to do. I am convinced that the plan it embodies of working through the existing departments and governmental machinery is better than to undertake to create new machinery or another independent commission.

We can not avoid the ultimate conclusion that the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior are now doing wonderful work in the whole field of the beneficial use of water for all purposes relating to more profitable agriculture and land cultivation with irrigation and stopping gully-

ing and erosion. My bill merely provides for coordinating all that work and putting it under a comprehensive plan, instead of hammering at it piecemeal and wasting the flood waters to an extent that can not be indefinitely continued in this country if our agriculture is to be sustained on a profitable basis.

The enormous beneficial results from the use of flood water to promote plant and tree growth in the humid and subhumid regions of our country, as well as in the arid region, are clearly shown in a report by Prof. W. J. Spillman, of the Department of Agriculture, on the work of Freeman Thorp at Hubert, Minn.

The value of retarding and spreading flood flow, slowing up the run-off, and using the waters beneficially is very briefly demonstrated in this report, which was originally published as Senate Document No. 228, Sixty-third Congress, third session, entitled "Conservation of Rainfall—Memorandum on the work of Col. Freeman Thorp on his farm at Hubert, Minn. From the report of Prof. W. J. Spillman to the Secretary of Agriculture."

The supply of that document has been exhausted, and I will ask that it be reprinted as an appendix to these remarks. It is peculiarly informative and pertinent to this discussion of flood control.

MEMORANDUM ON THE WORK OF COL. FREEMAN THORP ON HIS FARM AT HUBERT, MINN.

On August 18 and 19, 1913, I had the privilege of examining the farm of Colonel Thorp, including his forest plantations, and of studying the interesting methods which he has there developed.

The most striking originality is apparent in all Colonel Thorp's work. He is a man who thinks deeply and rationally on problems which arise in his work, and he has worked out a number of important problems in connection with farming, especially for his own locality, though some of these problems pertain to wide regions. I will discuss these problems separately and outline the solutions for them which Colonel Thorp has found, indicating my opinion as to the general applicability of the methods developed.

SOIL

The soil on Colonel Thorp's tract is, in the main, a light sand, but interspersed here and there are considerable areas of muck land.

EMBANKMENT SYSTEM

Colonel Thorp has instituted on the 1,500 acres of land which he owns a simple system of embankments constructed at very small cost, which accomplishes the following purposes:

In the first place, it conserves the entire rainfall of the region, causing the water to soak into the soil without run-off. Secondly, it prevents soil erosion. In the third place, the prevention of erosion incidentally prevents the washing away of soluble salts in the soil.

The embankments referred to are not so numerous as to prevent all surface flow of water, but they are so arranged, so far as I could see, over the whole tract as to cause all surface flow to lodge in places where it is beneficial rather than harmful.

Colonel Thorp's tract may be divided into forests, pastures, and cultivated fields. The embankment system is found on all three classes of land. The prevention of run-off in his forest tracts appears to have greatly increased the growth of forest trees in those localities where the water is held by the embankments. He has purposely left one tract of forest without embankments, though whatever run-off occurs from it is caught elsewhere. The forest growth in this section of his timbered lands is much less satisfactory than in those sections where the embankments occur.

It might be urged that on lands as sandy as those in question there would be practically no run-off even without the embankments. It happened that while I was at this place a considerable rainfall occurred. Water ran freely over sandy soils near Colonel Thorp's house. But the system of embankments in that locality led this water into a garden tract, where it was useful.

I am of the opinion that in the sandy soils of the North the simple system of easily constructed embankments used by Colonel Thorp could easily be made to prevent all run-off. The saving of moisture thus made would be less striking than in some other sections, on account of the sandy nature of the soil, yet the results on this farm show that the system is important even for these sandy soils. In arid and semiarid regions, especially where the soil is not sandy, and where rainfall, when it does occur, is more or less torrential, I am of opinion that this system would be of even greater value than it is on the sandy soils of northern Minnesota. In what we may call the semihumid belt lying between the humid regions of the East and the semiarid regions of the West the embankment system would doubtless be of great value and would insure crops in many years where there would otherwise be failure.

In this connection I would call your attention to the inclosed extract from the Kansas Farmer, of July 19, by Prof. Edward C. Johnson, giving an account of a very similar embankment system in use in certain portions of the State of Kansas. Professor Johnson gives it credit for marked effect on crop yields.

[Extracts from *Kansas Farmer*, July 19, 1913. Copyright, 1913]

"CONTOUR FARMING IN KANSAS"

"By Edward C. Johnson, K. S. A. C."

"Contour farming is the name given to a system of farming on rolling lands which are contoured in more or less undulating ridges around the slopes in order to prevent excessive run-off and soil washing after torrential rains. It has been used for many years on the sandy, rolling lands of Alabama, Georgia, and the Carolinas, where soil washing is very troublesome, and is now being used in the best young orchards of Maryland and the Virginias. Until late years, however, contour farming was unknown in Kansas."

"Adaptations of this system are now in use in this State in the northeast section to prevent soil washing and in western Kansas to catch and hold water. In Leavenworth County Mr. J. M. Gilman, famous corn man and experimenter, has commenced to work his rolling fields on a contour plan. With an improvised level consisting of a 2 by 4, 14 feet long, and a carpenter's level, he has laid off base lines in his fields with a slope of $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches to every 14 feet. These base lines are run at such a distance apart that the average drop from one to the other is 6 feet. This leaves the lines 30 to 60 feet apart. In plowing these lands Mr. Gilman throws the back furrows on the base lines and the dead furrows come midway between, thus ridging the land slightly. The same system of plowing will be followed from year to year until the fields are shaped into gently rolling contours or terraces, which will carry any excess of water and will prevent washing after the heaviest rains. Even this year, when the land has been plowed only once on this plan, soil washing has been effectively prevented. As the ridges are not abrupt but gently rolling, crops are planted on the land and handled without regard to the ridges."

"In western Kansas, on the farm of F. J. and D. J. Rundle, Almena, Norton County, a still more interesting modification of contour farming is found. Here a system of contouring has been used for four years, not so much to prevent soil washing as to prevent useless waste of water by excessive run-off. In this region moisture is usually the limiting factor in crop production, and if every drop can be saved much is gained. Four years ago, therefore, the Rundle brothers devised a contour system to prevent waste of water. With the aid of a farm level, similar to a surveyor's level but much less expensive, they laid out base lines around the slopes on their rolling fields, 50 to 100 feet apart, giving no slope to them whatever."

"In planting corn or sorghums they start the lister on a base line, listing parallel to this line until half the land is listed. The lister is then started on the next base line and continued on both sides of it and parallel to it until the listed furrows meet the listed portion next to the preceding base line. Any small irregular strips which may remain are then listed in short furrows parallel to one listed side or the other. When these are finished listing is started on the next base line, etc., until the field is planted. Now, when the rains come in torrents, as is often the case in western Kansas, the water is caught in the furrows, which often are filled from rim to rim, so that clear belts of water may be seen stretching around the slopes. After ordinary showers there is no run-off whatever, while after a torrential rain the run-off is reduced to a minimum and the water soaks into the ground instead of being wasted uselessly. The additional moisture thus utilized often is sufficient to insure successful crops, where if run-off were allowed failure would result. The Rundle brothers have had successful crops in seasons when their neighbors, farming according to the usual methods, have had little or nothing."

"This system is also used when oats and wheat are grown, the land being ridged slightly along the base lines by an improvised grader or drag, made of planking, or by plowing back furrows along the base lines, leaving dead furrows midway between."

"Contour farming could undoubtedly be utilized profitably in this State to a much greater extent than at present. In the northeast section there is much rolling land which is not cut up too badly to contour easily. Here contouring to prevent soil washing would be found practicable in many cases not only where general farming is carried on but also where young orchards are being planted."

"In western Kansas rolling lands or lands sloping slightly are also exceedingly plentiful. Here, where every drop of water that comes should be saved and utilized to the utmost, contour farming will be a wonderful help in water conservation."

In humid and superhumid regions it is doubtful if Colonel Thorp's system could be utilized without modification, on account of the excessive amount of moisture it would hold on the soil in many places. But by a very slight modification, such as is seen in the Mangum terrace described in Bureau of Plant Industry Circular 94, the system would add greatly to the proportion of the rainfall absorbed by the soil and at the same time dispose of the surplus which would be injurious rather than beneficial if held on the soil."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Houston].

Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Cross], in the course of his interesting debate, referred in terms to the Navy of this country in such a way as to indicate that he has but

little confidence in its ability. I rise to bring to the attention of the House the fact that the Navy of this country has never failed it. The Navy from a small beginning in the War of Independence has always fought with honor. During the War of 1812 it was the Navy that largely brought the war to an end. The war with France was stopped by the Navy. The Tripolitan barbarians were defeated by the Navy, and the conclusion of that unfortunate fratricidal War between the States was helped through the splitting of the Confederacy in twain by the Navy. The war with Spain was concluded by the Navy; and in the World War, starting from scratch, if you please, with practically no merchant marine, the Navy of this country transported almost 50 per cent of the men across the seas without a single casualty in going across. I think the country need never fear that the Navy will fail it in its hour of peril.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk now read the bill for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment. The Clerk read down to and including line 8, on page 4.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOCH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12236, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

TIME FOR CUTTING TIMBER ON CERTAIN LANDS IN OREGON

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 4057) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to extend the time for cutting and removing timber from certain revested and reconveyed lands in the State of Oregon.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands a similar House bill is on the calendar?

Mr. COLTON. I am informed they are identical.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, empowered, at his discretion, to extend the period within which, under the terms of the patent therefor, the timber may be cut and removed by the purchaser thereof, his heirs or assigns, from revested lands of the Oregon-California Railroad grant lands, and reconveyed lands of the Coos Bay Military Wagon Road land grants, either heretofore or hereafter sold by the United States; and the Secretary of the Interior is further hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as he may deem proper governing the granting of extensions of time to such purchasers and the length of such extension and the method by which and terms upon which the same may be granted.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. As as I understand it, this is an extension of time for the sale of timber on certain lands which was authorized by Congress some 8 or 10 years ago.

Mr. COLTON. That is correct. It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time in his discretion.

Mr. GARNER. The only criticism I have to make of it is this: This is giving the Secretary of the Interior discretion with no limitation. He could extend it 10 years or 20 years or 50 years. I do not think that is good public policy. I think the Public Lands Committee ought to have put a limitation upon it, ought to have guarded the matter as far as possible. Nobody questions the integrity or the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, but there have been times in the history of the country, and not so long ago, when discretion placed in the Secretary of the Interior was a dangerous one. It is not good policy for Congress to turn over to the Secretary of the Interior without limitation of his discretion, in respect to the sale of timber, and to make rules and regulations under which it may be sold.

Mr. COLTON. The extension must be made under the terms of the patent that has already been issued for this timber, which requires that it must be done within a period of 10 years.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman consider this bill to mean that the Secretary of the Interior could not extend it in excess of 10 years?

Mr. COLTON. That is my understanding.

Mr. GARNER. But the bill does not say so. It leaves it in his discretion. I talked to gentlemen interested in this matter. I shall not object to it, because it is desirable legislation perhaps, but I do place in the Record the suggestion that committees do not leave too much discretion to the executive departments of the Government.

Mr. COLTON. I am sure the Secretary of the Interior in extending this time will impose more advantageous conditions to the Government on the control of it than have heretofore

been imposed. He will make rules and regulations requiring them to make regulations for fire protection, which has not been had heretofore.

Mr. GARNER. Let us hope so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, through my own misinformation, I inadvertently misinformed the House in saying that the bill (S. 4098) to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Browning, Mont., in the extension of the high-school building to be available to Indian children of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, which I asked unanimous consent to have considered at that time, was identical in form with the bill H. R. 10215, which was on the House Calendar. I should have made a comparison. My information was that they were absolutely the same. I find that there is one difference. I should have said that they were similar rather than identical. If anyone has any objection to the procedure taken at that time, I would be very glad to ask unanimous consent now to vacate it and take the matter up again.

Mr. GARNER. The substance of the bills, I take it, was the same; that is, the object of the legislation to be accomplished?

Mr. LEAVITT. Oh, yes.

Mr. SNELL. They were practically the same?

Mr. LEAVITT. Yes.

GRAND ARMY MEMORIAL DAY SERVICES

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 3498, to aid the Grand Army of the Republic in its Memorial Day services May 30, 1930, which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 3498, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 3498

A bill to aid the Grand Army of the Republic in its Memorial Day services, May 30, 1930

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of \$2,500 be, and the same is hereby, authorized to be appropriated to aid the Grand Army of the Republic Memorial Day Corporation in its Memorial Day services, May 30, 1930, and in the decoration of the graves of the Union soldiers, sailors, and marines with flags and flowers in the national cemeteries in the District of Columbia and in the Arlington National Cemetery in Virginia.

Sec. 2. That said fund shall be paid to the treasurer of the Grand Army of the Republic Memorial Day Corporation and shall be disbursed by him for said memorial service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—and I do not intend to object—I understand the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] approves of this and that it meets the approval of the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. QUIN. That is correct. And I may say that they usually put flowers on Confederate graves at the same time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate bill was passed was laid on the table.

VETERANS' RELIEF BILL

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Johnson veterans' relief legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I voted recently for the Johnson veterans' relief bill because I believed it to be just and meritorious. This bill will provide relief for tens of thousands of veterans.

Some time ago I introduced in the House a bill to pay the entire amount of the adjusted-compensation certificates as a cash bonus to veterans of the World War immediately. My bill is practically identical with the Brookhart bill in the Senate.

After talking personally with President Hoover and realizing the opposition of the United States Treasury Department and

in Congress to the heavy strain of paying the entire amount which calls for the expenditure of approximately three and a half billion dollars, I presented two alternative bills—one providing for payment of 25 per cent of the adjusted compensation in cash and the other providing for 50 per cent.

I have introduced a fourth measure which provides that no interest be charged war veterans who borrow money on their adjusted-compensation certificates. My proposal would kill interest rates on past loans and prevent charging of interest in the future. This is the least controversial of all my veterans' relief bills, I believe.

I do not believe there is any community in the country where the number of veterans, as compared to the total population, is greater than it is in Detroit. This arises from the fact that so many men of the veterans' age have become dissatisfied with their local situation and have moved to Detroit to get better employment at higher wages and under better working conditions as to hours, and so forth.

The Director of the Census, however, will inform you that the unemployment situation in Detroit is very acute because of that very fact. An exceedingly large number of veterans are in distress, and the sentiment for the payment of their adjusted-compensation certificates immediately and in cash is stronger in Detroit than probably in any other center in the United States. The demand for the payment of the bonus in cash immediately for needy, destitute, or disabled ex-service men is practically unanimous.

The plight of sick or disabled veterans is considerably remedied by the Johnson bill. It will afford just and needed relief to tens of thousands of cases for which no relief is possible under the present law. I have personally come in contact with thousands of cases, many of them face to face and some by letter and petition, and I vouch for the genuineness of these claims.

Many of these cases are pitiful in the extreme. I have been nearly 20 years in the Federal Government service and have handled tens of thousands of claims of veterans and dependents of the Civil War, Spanish War, Great War, and other forms of Army and Navy service. I never knew conditions to be so bad in this class of cases as at present except that Civil War claims have grown less and less during each of these 20 years.

I do not believe anybody living on the east side of Detroit has had more contacts with veterans' cases or closer relations with them over a long period of years than myself. Not only have I had a part in working for and voting for great veterans' relief bills but I have personally headed tens of thousands of individual cases during these 20 years.

First, I began as a Congressman's secretary in 1911 and continued this work for many years. Before the Great War and at the time of Villa's raid across the Mexican border, when three or four regiments of Michigan troops were sent to quell that trouble, I was one of the organizers and founders of the Detroit Patriotic Relief Fund which raised thousands of dollars to take care of the destitute women and children of those Michigan soldiers.

At first we had to herd those sick, hungry, and destitute women and children in the Light Guard Armory and afford them relief there; then we carried food, fuel, medicine, clothing, and rent into their homes.

Then the Great War broke out and the Detroit Patriotic Relief Fund which was doing such wonderful work was taken over almost entirely by the Red Cross and was known as the home-service section. Immediately thousands of fresh cases developed in the families of tens of thousands of Detroit boys who left for the war.

I became a director of this home-service section of the Red Cross and served actively upon that board for eight years including the year or two as a director of the fund.

We helped in the war by giving the soldier the ease of mind and confidence and security that his loved ones at home were getting every attention and in many cases they were better cared for than when the soldier himself was providing for them, for we raised hundreds of thousands of dollars and saw that each family had food, fuel, clothing, and shelter, and besides that they had first-class medical and dental attention.

In many cases we saw that the medical operations which the soldier himself could not provide were furnished by the best surgeons in Detroit at the best hospitals without charge to the dependent.

Faithfully for eight years I assiduously gave my attention to that work. No director signed more checks or vouchers for money for these dependents than I did. Many cases in which the emergency was difficult I gave my personal attention, as for instance, where the landlord wanted to throw the family out on the street for continued nonpayment of rent or because of some nuisance, or where debts of long standing or recent accumulation had to be met outside our budget.

There was never a breath of scandal against my handling any of this money or as a matter of fact against any other director involved. There was never a claim of unfairness or prejudice raised against us arising out of racial, nationality, or religious affiliations. It was a noble work carried out under dominance of the highest ideals.

The distress which I witnessed in thousands of families roused my sympathy, and I stood for the soldiers' cash bonus of 1923-24 in the face of serious opposition from powerful interests which thought we could not afford that amount of money at that time.

I worked and voted for the soldiers' adjusted compensation bill which provided nearly \$4,000,000,000 for veterans. I received hundreds of letters and telegrams urging me not to do this, and I had to meet that opposition when I ran for reelection. I also voted to pass this bill over the veto of President Coolidge.

I favored the soldiers' bonus passed by the Michigan State Legislature, and did all I could to secure passage of that legislation.

This year I introduced in Congress a bill to pay the adjusted compensation certificates in cash immediately rather than to wait for their payment upon death or in 1945 when the service men lived that long.

I was one of the first to recognize the injustice of taxing a needy veteran 6 per cent compound interest on loans made on his adjusted compensation certificate. In nearly every case the veteran gets but a small percentage of the total amount due him and then the 6 per cent compound interest eats up the rest by 1945.

I pointed out that the Government sometimes loans to the District of Columbia on public projects large sums of money without any interest whatsoever.

I pointed out that the Government has a four hundred million dollar revolving loan fund for the benefit of farmers who never fought for their country and the rate of interest is about 3¼ per cent.

I pointed out that one of the committees on which I serve—the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee—has a loan fund of \$250,000,000 for the patriotic enterprise of building up the American merchant marine, and that money is loaned to shipbuilders out of this fund at about 3¼ per cent.

I pointed out that this same committee recently put through an amendment that while a ship is under construction, possibly over a long period of time, the rate of interest on the loan is slightly over 2 per cent.

In public addresses I have declared for the payment in cash of the full face value of the adjusted service compensation certificates immediately when the veteran is needy, destitute, or disabled. Also in public addresses I have made speeches and stirred up sentiment for payment of 25 or 50 per cent of the adjusted compensation certificates or whatever the Government can afford.

Thoughtless people think it is easy for the Government to raise the three and one-half billions and pay the adjusted compensation certificates immediately. I saw President Hoover personally on this recently and urged him to do so, but of course, I knew the difficulty he and Secretary Mellon face in providing these three and one-half billions immediately. That is why I have said in public speeches that I was willing to take what I could get and vote for all that possibly could be raised by the Government now to pay off these veterans.

Some people criticize the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled Veterans' organization, Spanish War Veterans' Association and the G. A. R. because they have not obtained from Congress larger sums of money for the veterans.

The Great War veterans, mainly through the efficient work done by the American Legion, has already secured a payment of \$5,000,000,000 from the taxpayers' pockets for veterans of the Great War. If the legislation already on the books is not added to, the payments provided for out of the National Treasury by 1940, will run to \$11,000,000,000.

Then will come a large amount in 1945 in payment of the adjusted compensation certificates provided in the law of 1924, which I voted for, and which we passed over the President's veto.

I say that the Congress has only done its duty in making these tremendous payments to veterans. I think they should be more just and more generous and provide further relief. I do not want to take time to argue the service of the veterans to the country nor the sacrifices they made. It is enough to say that they paid more to the country in these services and sacrifices than they are receiving or will receive in cash out of the taxpayers' pockets.

Hospitalization for needy cases has always been one of the main projects of the American Legion and other veterans' or-

ganizations. For adequate hospitalization I have always worked strenuously.

On March 29 of this year I helped dedicate a Federal hospital at Windmill Point, Detroit, which was secured by Congressman McLeod and myself only after strenuous labor.

This year I voted for a Federal hospital bill amounting to about \$17,000,000, which included a large item for the veterans' hospital at Camp Custer, Battle Creek.

A couple of weeks ago I appeared before the House Veterans' Committee and supported officers of the American Legion of Michigan and of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Michigan in their efforts to secure additional beds for the Federal hospital at Camp Custer.

This year I appeared before the House Pensions Committee and argued for an age and service bill for all Spanish-American War veterans. The committee finally voted out a bill appropriating about \$11,000,000, and I voted on the floor of the House for this bill.

During my many years of service in Washington I have worked for a number of bills for the relief of Civil War veterans and their dependents.

I challenge anybody who presumes to criticize my attitude on veterans' relief to produce any man on the east side of Detroit in my district who has worked longer and more effectively and more powerfully for American veterans' relief than myself.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight in which to file a report on Senate Joint Resolution 49, to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of the Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals, in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules for printing in the RECORD. The resolution is as follows:

House Resolution 220

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to appoint a committee of five Members of the House of Representatives to investigate Communist propaganda in the United States and particularly in our educational institutions; the activities and membership of the Communist Party of the United States; and all affiliated organizations and groups thereof; the ramification of the Communist International in the United States; The Amtorg Trading Corporation; The Daily Worker; and all entities, groups or individuals who are alleged to advise, teach, or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or attempt to undermine our republican form of government by inciting riots, sabotage, or revolutionary disorders.

The committee shall report to the House the results of its investigation, including such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For such purposes the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, whether or not the House is in session, to hold such hearings, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from New York when he expects to call that up?

Mr. SNELL. We expect to call it up at the first opportunity. It may be several days from now. The German debt resolution is one of the first things to be called up.

Mr. GARNER. May I ask the gentleman from New York if he has had hearings on this resolution?

Mr. SNELL. We had.

Mr. GARNER. Were they printed?

Mr. SNELL. They were not.

Mr. GARNER. Can we have them printed, so that the House may have copies of them?

Mr. SNELL. I see no reason for not having them printed.

Mr. GARNER. As I recall, for four or five years there have been no investigation of anything by the House. The other body has made several investigations. Now we have a question where the Committee on Rules thinks it necessary to authorize an investigation. It seems to me we ought to have a reason for it. The only reason we can get is from the statement of the gentleman from New York or his colleagues, or

from the printed hearings. I think we should have the hearings printed.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman from New York has no objection to having the hearings printed, and he may say that it was with some reluctance that he brought in the resolution. The Committee on Rules has not been in favor of investigations, but here is a resolution that we thought proper to bring in. From the information furnished us from the hearings and private sources, the members of the Committee on Rules did not want to take the responsibility of withholding it.

Mr. GARNER. I am not making any criticism of the gentleman from New York or of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SNELL. Whether you are or not, I am just stating the facts.

Mr. GARNER. I know it has been the practice of the gentleman's committee for several years to print the hearings on statements and reports made to them. This must be an extraordinary case. Heretofore for five or six years the gentleman has sat upon resolutions calling for investigations or kept them in his pocket.

Mr. SNELL. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I have never kept any in my pocket. I do not handle them in that manner.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman has kept them in the committee.

Mr. SNELL. Every resolution reported out by our committee has been presented to the House.

INCREASES UNDER THE HAWLEY-SMOOT TARIFF BILL

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a list of the increases in tariff rates in the pending tariff bill as compared with those in the present law.

Mr. SNELL. Have not those been printed?

Mr. GARNER. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

List of increases carried in the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, showing actual or computed ad valorem rates based on 1923 imports under Fordney-McCumber Act and Hawley-Smoot bill—Specific rates shown in some instances

SCHEDULE 1.—CHEMICALS, OILS, AND PAINTS

	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill
Acids and acid anhydrides:		
Acetic acid, containing not more than 65 per cent of acetic acid.	3/4 cent per pound.	1 3/4 cents per pound.
Formic acid.	25 per cent.	38.73 per cent.
Tannic acid—		
Containing less than 50 per cent of tannic acid.	4 cents per pound.	5 cents per pound.
Containing 50 per cent or more of tannic acid.	10 cents per pound.	11 cents per pound.
Tartaric acid.	6 cents per pound.	8 cents per pound.
Chromic acid.	Free.	25 per cent.
Stearic acid.	13.28 per cent.	Do.
Ammonium compounds: Ammonium carbonate and bicarbonate.	30.23 per cent.	40.31 per cent.
Barium compounds:		
Barium chloride.	116.07 per cent.	185.71 per cent.
Barium oxide.	25 per cent.	46.83 per cent.
Caffeine citrate.	91.55 per cent.	151.55 per cent.
Calcium acetate.	Free.	28.46 per cent.
Casein.	19.47 per cent.	42.83 per cent.
Compounds of casein, known as galalith or any other name, in finished or partly finished articles, n. s. p. f.	45.15 per cent.	70.15 per cent.
Chalk, dry, ground, or bolted whiting.	25 per cent.	175.76 per cent.
Diethylbarbituric acid, salts, and compounds.	Do.	30.61 per cent.
Cellulose acetate, compounds, combinations, mixtures:		
Cellulose in blocks, sheets, rods, tubes, etc., finished or partly finished articles, n. s. p. f.	60 per cent.	80 per cent.
Cellulose compounds, including pyroxylin, and other cellulose esters and ethers, combinations or mixtures—		
Transparent sheets more than 0.003 and not more than 0.032 of 1 inch in thickness.	50 per cent.	56.25 per cent.
Transparent sheets not more than 0.003 of 1 inch in thickness.	25 per cent.	45 per cent.
Ethers and esters: Butyl acetate.	Do.	53.34 per cent.
Hexamethylenetetramine.	Do.	39.50 per cent.
Gelatin:		
Edible, valued at less than 40 cents per pound.	35.63 per cent.	42.33 per cent.
Inedible, valued at less than 40 cents per pound.	27.73 per cent.	35.30 per cent.
Inedible, valued at more than 40 cents per pound.	28.41 per cent.	34.61 per cent.
Vegetable glue.	34.27 per cent.	44 per cent.
Pectin.	20 per cent.	25 per cent.

List of increases carried in the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, showing actual or computed ad valorem rates based on 1923 imports under Fordney-McCumber Act and Hawley-Smoot bill—Specific rates shown in some instances—Continued

SCHEDULE 1.—CHEMICALS, OILS, AND PAINTS—continued

	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill
Glue, glue size, and fish glue:		
Valued less than 40 cents per pound.	37.25 per cent.	48 per cent.
Valued more than 40 cents per pound.	29.38 per cent.	35.72 per cent.
Juice of lemons, limes, oranges, or other citrus fruits, unfit for beverage purposes.	Free.	65.33 per cent.
Magnesium compounds: Oxide or calcined magnesina.	17.46 per cent.	34.92 per cent.
Oils, animal and fish:		
Sperm, refined, or otherwise processed.	19.32 per cent.	27.05 per cent.
Spermaceti wax.	Free.	25 per cent.
Wool grease containing more than 2 per cent free fatty acids.	20.48 per cent.	40.95 per cent.
Wool grease containing 2 per cent or less, not medicinal.	22.62 per cent.	45.23 per cent.
Wool grease, medicinal, including adeps lane.	11.36 per cent.	34.09 per cent.
Oils, vegetable:		
Linseed or flaxseed and combinations and mixtures.	40.83 per cent.	55.68 per cent.
Olive, weighing, with container, less than 40 pounds.	40.54 per cent.	51.35 per cent.
Palm-kernel oil, edible.	Free.	12.32 per cent.
Sesame oil, edible.	Do.	28.14 per cent.
Soybean oil.	2 1/2 cents per pound.	3 1/2 cents per pound.
Phosphorus trichloride.	25 per cent.	42.14 per cent.
Precipitated barium sulphate or blanc fixe.	43.57 per cent.	54.46 per cent.
Ultramarine blue and all other blues containing ultramarine, valued at more than 10 cents per pound.	3 cents per pound.	4 cents per pound.
Decolorizing, deodorizing, or gas-absorbing chars and carbons.	20 per cent.	45 per cent.
Vermilion reds, containing quicksilver.	21 per cent.	26.37 per cent.
Cuprous oxide.	25 per cent.	35 per cent.
Lithopone and other combinations or mixtures of zinc sulphide and barium sulphate, containing 30 per cent or more zinc sulphide.	29.17 per cent.	44.17 per cent.
Potassium compounds:		
Potassium citrate.	25 per cent.	30.69 per cent.
Potassium permanganate.	44.30 per cent.	66.45 per cent.
Potassium nitrate or saltpeter, refined.	12.75 per cent.	25.50 per cent.
Sodium.	Free.	25 per cent.
Potassium.	Do.	Do.
Lithium, beryllium, and caesium.	Do.	Do.
Sodium compounds:		
Sodium phosphate (except pyro) n. s. p. f.	22.31 per cent.	33.46 per cent.
Sodium phosphate, containing less than 45 per cent water.	22.73 per cent.	68.18 per cent.
Sodium silicofluoride.	25 per cent.	42.93 per cent.
Sodium sulphate, anhydrous.	8.01 per cent.	12.01 per cent.
Starch:		
Potato.	49.45 per cent.	70.64 per cent.
N. s. p. f.	14.76 per cent.	22.14 per cent.
Rice.	18.30 per cent.	27.45 per cent.
Corn.	7.11 per cent.	10.67 per cent.
Wheat.	19.02 per cent.	28.50 per cent.
Soluble or chemically treated starch.	24.87 per cent.	39.79 per cent.
Dextrine, made from potato starch or potato flour.	43.83 per cent.	58.45 per cent.
Dextrine, n. s. p. f., burnt starch, dextrine substitutes.	25.11 per cent.	40.18 per cent.
Strychnine alkaloid.	48.21 per cent.	64.28 per cent.
Other salts of strychnine.	29.30 per cent.	39.15 per cent.
Turpentine:		
Spirits of.	Free.	5 per cent.
Gum.	Do.	Do.
Rosin.	Do.	Do.
Vanadium compounds:		
Vanadic acid, vanadic anhydride, and salts.	25 per cent.	40 per cent.
Chemical compounds, mixtures, and salts wholly or in chief value of vanadium, n. s. p. f.	Do.	Do.
Zinc sulphide.	10.73 per cent.	21.46 per cent.
Ethyl-hydrocupreine, salts and compounds.	Free.	20 cents per ounce.
Paints, colors, and pigments, commonly known as artists', school, students', or children's paints or colors.	41.64 per cent.	74.12 per cent.

SCHEDULE 2.—EARTHS, EARTHENWARE, AND GLASSWARE

	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill
Brick:		
Sand-lime.	Free.	24.73 per cent.
Common building.	Do.	23.52 per cent.
Tiles:		
Unglazed.	49.17 per cent.	61.47 per cent.
Glazed.	50.92 per cent.	63.65 per cent.
Ceramic mosaics—		
Valued at 40 cents per square foot.	49.77 per cent.	62.21 per cent.
Valued at over 40 cents per square foot.	50 per cent.	60 per cent.
Other tiles, including cement tiles—		
Valued not over 40 cents per square foot.	51.28 per cent.	64.10 per cent.
Valued over 40 cents per square foot.	50 per cent.	60 per cent.
Quarry tiles, red or brown, measuring 7/8 inch or over in thickness.	66.19 per cent.	70 per cent.
Periclase, crude.	Free.	2 3/4 cents per pound.
Cement, Portland, and other hydraulic.	Do.	16.86 per cent.
Plaster of Paris: Statues, statuettes, and bas-reliefs, wholly or in chief value of, manufactures of.	25 per cent.	50 per cent.

List of increases carried in the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, showing actual or computed ad valorem rates based on 1928 imports under Fordney-McCumber Act and Hawley-Smoot bill—Specific rates shown in some instances—Continued

SCHEDULE 2.—EARTHS, EARTHENWARE, AND GLASSWARE—continued

	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill
Pumice, wholly or partly manufactured.....	96.84 per cent.	132.05 per cent.
Feldspar, crude.....	Free	12.38 per cent.
Glass sand.....	do.	215.84 per cent.
Mica:		
Valued over 15 cents per pound.....	25 per cent.	31.70 per cent.
Manufactured, cut.....	30 per cent.	40 per cent.
Scrap and waste valued at not more than 5 cents per pound.....	10 per cent.	25 per cent.
Scrap and waste valued over 5 cents per pound.....	do.	40 per cent.
Films cut to dimensions.....	40 per cent.	45 per cent.
Talc, steatite, soapstone, French chalk, ground, washed, powdered, etc. (except toilet preparations).....	25 per cent.	35 per cent.
Earthenware, stoneware, and crockery:		
Household use, table, toilet, and kitchen ware for domestic—plain white, brown, yellow, red, or black, not decorated.....	45 per cent.	62.25 per cent.
Hotel, plain white, brown, yellow, red, or black, decorated.....	50 per cent.	56.44 per cent.
Hotel, plain white, brown, yellow, red, or black, not decorated.....	45 per cent.	54.11 per cent.
Sanitary earthenware:		
Plain white, brown, yellow, red, or black, not decorated.....	do.	47.26 per cent.
Plain white, brown, yellow, red, or black, decorated.....	50 per cent.	51.37 per cent.
Clock cases, plaques, ornaments, vases, etc.: Plain white, brown, yellow, red, or black, not decorated.....	45 per cent.	63.46 per cent.
Plain white, brown, yellow, red, or black, decorated.....	50 per cent.	54.96 per cent.
All other articles composed wholly or in chief value of earthenware, stoneware, and crockery:		
Plain white, brown, yellow, red, or black, not decorated.....	45 per cent.	88.43 per cent.
Plain white, brown, yellow, red, or black, decorated.....	50 per cent.	67.74 per cent.
Filter tubes.....	45 per cent.	60 per cent.
Terra cotta.....	40 per cent.	55 per cent.
China, porcelain, and other vitrified wares:		
Household use—		
Table, toilet, and kitchen ware, not including bone china—		
Plain white or brown, not decorated.....	60 per cent.	76.76 per cent.
Plain white or brown, decorated.....	70 per cent.	81.06 per cent.
Hotel ware, plain white or brown, not decorated.....	60 per cent.	73.74 per cent.
Hotel ware, plain white or brown, decorated.....	70 per cent.	77.39 per cent.
China and porcelain ware containing 25 per cent or more of calcined bone:		
Household use—		
Table, toilet, and kitchen ware, plain white.....	50 per cent.	54.58 per cent.
Table, toilet, and kitchen ware, decorated.....	55 per cent.	56.89 per cent.
Hotel ware—		
Plain white.....	50 per cent.	56.63 per cent.
Decorated.....	55 per cent.	56.34 per cent.
Graphite or plumbago:		
Lump, chip, or dust.....	20 per cent.	30 per cent.
Flake.....	1½ cents per pound.	15¢ per cent.
Carbons, electric-light carbons, less than ¼ inch.....	45 per cent.	60 per cent.
Chemical and other scientific glassware:		
Lamp-blown volumetric ware.....	65 per cent.	85 per cent.
Articles for chemical, scientific and experimental purposes.....	do.	Do.
Articles, same, of fused quartz.....	30 per cent.	50 per cent.
Fused quartz tubes or tubing.....	do.	40 per cent.
Illuminating glassware: Globes and shades.....	60 per cent.	70 per cent.
Blown glassware:		
Blown or partly blown.....	55 per cent.	60 per cent.
Cut, engraved, ornamented, etc.....	do.	Do.
Other blown glassware, n. s. p. f.....	do.	Do.
Tube cage glasses.....	do.	Do.
Glass perfume and toilet bottles.....	do.	75 per cent.
Pressed glass tableware, cut, engraved, ornamented, etc.....	do.	60 per cent.
Christmas tree ornaments.....	do.	Do.
Glass bobbins and other glass parts of textile machinery.....	30 per cent.	Do.
Laminated glass, composed of layers of glass and other materials.....	50 per cent.	Do.
Optical glass for spectacles and optical instruments.....	45 per cent.	50 per cent.
Scientific instruments: Spectroscopes, spectrometers, and other optical instruments, frames, and mountings.....	do.	60 per cent.
Electric lamp carbon filaments.....	20 per cent.	30 per cent.
Windows, stained or painted.....	50 per cent.	60 per cent.
Manufactures of glass ruled or etched for photographic reproduction or engraving processes, etc.....	Free	55 per cent.
Granite:		
Rough.....	8.89 per cent.	14.82 per cent.
Hewn, dressed, or polished.....	50 per cent.	60 per cent.
(By the insertion of the word "pitched" practically all of the rough granite is transferred to manufactured rate, and in some sizes and quality the increase in rate will be as high as 1,500 per cent.)		

List of increases carried in the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, showing actual or computed ad valorem rates based on 1928 imports under Fordney-McCumber Act and Hawley-Smoot bill—Specific rates shown in some instances—Continued

SCHEDULE 2.—EARTHS, EARTHENWARE, AND GLASSWARE—continued

	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill
Glass:		
Cylinder, crown, and sheet (window)—		
Unpolished.....	44.37 per cent.	66.56 per cent.
Polished.....	14.67 per cent.	35.07 per cent.
Fluted, rolled, ribbed or rough plate glass.....	14.96 per cent.	15.94 per cent.
Ground or obscured.....	87.16 per cent.	93.64 per cent.
Cast polished plate glass.....	79.87 per cent.	85.84 per cent.
Bentonite:		
Unwrought and unmanufactured.....	\$1 per ton.	\$1.50 per ton.
Wrought or manufactured.....	\$2 per ton.	\$3.25 per ton.
Mirrors:		
Cast polished plate glass and polished window glass, silvered and used as mirrors and looking glasses, over 144 and not over 384 square inches.....	37.03 per cent.	45 per cent.
Cast, over 384 and not over 720 square inches.....	37.76 per cent.	Do.
Plate glass, cast, polished silvered and looking glass plate, over 144 and over 384 square inches.....	40 per cent.	50 per cent.
Plate glass, etc.—		
Over 384 and not over 720 square inches.....	do.	Do.
Over 720 square inches.....	do.	Do.
Cylinder, crown, and sheet glass silvered and looking-glass plates, over 144 and not over 384 square inches.....	do.	Do.
Slate, roofing, mantels, school, slabs, chimney pieces, etc.....	15 per cent.	25 per cent.

SCHEDULE 3.—METALS AND MANUFACTURES OF

	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill
Manganese ore: Manganiferous iron ore containing 10 to 30 per cent manganese.....	Free	91.04 per cent
Tungsten ore or concentrates.....	191.19 per cent.	212.44 per cent
Steel ingots, blooms, billets, etc., valued not over 1 cent per pound.....	22.01 per cent.	26.91 per cent.
Steel bars, valued not over 1 cent per pound.....	20.96 per cent.	26.32 per cent.
Wire woven cloth:		
Mesher finer than 30 and not finer than 90 wires to the linear inch.....	35 per cent.	40 per cent.
Mesher finer than 90 wires to linear inch.....	45 per cent.	50 per cent.
Anvils, weighing over 5 pounds.....	23.06 per cent.	42.57 per cent.
Cast-iron pipe.....	20 per cent.	25 per cent.
Chains, sprocket and machine chains and parts.....	35 per cent.	40 per cent.
Staples in strip form for use in paper fasteners or stapling machines.....	0.6 cent.	2 cents per pound.
Butts and hinges, finished or unfinished.....	40 per cent.	45 per cent.
Silver plated hollow ware.....	do.	50 per cent.
Umbrella ribs and tubes.....	50 per cent.	60 per cent.
Needles:		
Latch.....	69.90 per cent.	79.90 per cent.
Spring-beard.....	66.67 per cent.	84.79 per cent.
Pens, with nib and barrel in one piece, metallic, except gold.....	7.06 per cent.	9.41 per cent.
Pens, other.....	31.46 per cent.	43.26 per cent.
Knives: Pen, pocket, pruning, budding, eraser, manicure, and other knives with folding blades, valued not over 40 cents per dozen.....	1 cent and 50 per cent.	14 cents and 50 per cent.
Surgical instruments and parts, n. s. p. f.....	45 per cent.	55 per cent.
Surgical needles.....	do.	Do.
Drawing instruments.....	40 per cent.	45 per cent.
Pliers, pinners, and nippers, valued more than \$2 per dozen.....	60 per cent.	10 cents and 60 per cent.
Pliers, pinners, valued at not more than \$2 per dozen.....	do.	5 cents and 60 per cent.
Bells (except church bells and carillons), finished or unfinished, bicycle, doorbells, etc.....	40 per cent.	50 per cent.
Shotgun barrels in single tubes, forged, rough bored.....	Free	10 per cent.
Pistols and revolvers, valued not over \$4 each.....	102.93 per cent.	131.69 per cent.
Electrical machinery: Generators, transformers, converters, motors, stationary, railway, vehicle automotive and others; fans and blowers; radio and wireless apparatus and parts; telegraph apparatus.....	30 per cent.	40 per cent.
Electrical machinery, n. s. p. f.....	do.	Do.
Turbine engines.....	15 per cent.	20 per cent.
Metal working machines and parts: Punches, shears, and bar cutters.....	30 per cent.	40 per cent.
Textile machinery: Cotton, wool, and other textile machinery, n. s. p. f.....	35 per cent.	Do.
Phosphor copper or phosphorus copper.....	Free	18 per cent.
Types.....	20 per cent.	30 per cent.
Zinc ore, containing not more than 3 per cent zinc.....	Free	35.57 per cent.
Print rollers.....	72 per cent.	94.65 per cent.
Manufactures of metal, not specially provided for:		
Platinum.....	60 per cent.	65 per cent.
Other plated ware except cutlery and jewelry.....	do.	Do.
Gold-plated articles.....	do.	Do.
Platinum-plated articles.....	do.	Do.
Gold, sterling-silver tableware.....	do.	Do.
Gold-lacquered articles.....	do.	Do.
Iron or steel ware not specially provided for.....	40 per cent.	45 per cent.
Iron axes.....	do.	Do.
Iron mechanics' tools: Twist drills, reamers, etc.....	do.	Do.
Iron builders' hardware: Hinges, door latches, hooks, window fasteners, door knobs, etc.....	do.	Do.
Nonferrous wares not specially provided for: Aluminum, copper, bronze, lead, nickel, brass, zinc, pewter, tin, wire, and others, not plated.....	do.	Do.

List of increases carried in the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, showing actual or computed ad valorem rates based on 1928 imports under Fordney-McCumber Act and Hawley-Smoot bill—Specific rates shown in some instances—Continued

SCHEDULE 3.—METALS AND MANUFACTURES OF—continued

	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill
Vehicles (except agricultural) n. s. p. f., cars and parts for railway, in chief value of metal.	40 per cent.	45 per cent.
Vehicles: Carriages, drays, and trucks and other vehicles and parts, n. s. p. f., in chief value of metal.	do.	Do.
Aluminum foil.	35 per cent.	40 per cent.
Metal powder in leaf.	11.11 per cent.	21.11 per cent.
Watches, medium grade, also cases and dials.		
NOTE.—Watches have been increased but comparison impossible.		
Clocks and movements; recorders of time, distance, or fares; meters for gas, water, and electricity; speed controllers and other regulating, recording, or indicating devices; estimated increase of paragraph carrying above articles.	61.22 per cent.	91.83 per cent.

SCHEDULE 4.—WOOD AND MANUFACTURES OF

Flooring, maple, birch, and beech.	Free	8 per cent.
Plywood.	33½ per cent.	40 per cent.
Plywood, alder.	do.	50 per cent.
Blinds, curtains, shades, screens, plain.	35 per cent.	Do.
Blinds, stained, dyed, painted, printed, polished, grained, or creosoted.	45 per cent.	Do.
Baskets, plain:		
Bamboo, wood or composition of wood, straw, papier-mâché, and palm leaf.	35 per cent.	Do.
Bamboo, stained, dyed, painted, polished, grained, or creosoted.	45 per cent.	Do.
Clothespins.	90.98 per cent.	121.31 per cent.
Furniture:		
House or cabinet furniture of wood (excluding chairs).	33½ per cent.	40 per cent.
Chairs.	do.	Do.
Paintbrush handles (this is one of the items reduced by President Coolidge).	16½ per cent.	33½ per cent.

SCHEDULE 5.—SUGAR, MOLASSES, AND MANUFACTURES OF

Sugar.	per 100 pounds.	\$1.76	\$2.
Molasses: Blackstrap.		4.53 per cent.	4.98 per cent.
Maple sugar.		23.46 per cent.	46.91 per cent.
Maple sirup.		30.02 per cent.	41.28 per cent.
Dextrose, testing not above 99.7 per cent, and dextrose sirup.		14.41 per cent.	18.92 per cent.
Sugar cane.	per ton.	\$1.	\$2.50.

SCHEDULE 6.—TOBACCO AND MANUFACTURES OF

Cigar wrapper tobacco:			
Unstemmed.	\$2.10 per pound.	\$2.27½ per pound.	per
Stemmed.	\$2.75 per pound.	\$2.92½ per pound.	per

SCHEDULE 7.—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS

Cattle, live:			
Weighing less than 700 pounds.	2 cents.	2½ cents per pound.	
Weighing over 700 pounds.	2½ cents.	3 cents per pound.	
Sheep and lambs.	23.19 per cent.	34.78 per cent.	
Goats.	109.86 per cent.	164.79 per cent.	
Swine.	5.68 per cent.	22.74 per cent.	
Meats:			
Beef:			
Fresh.	12.60 per cent.	25.37 per cent.	
Canned.	20 per cent.	49.15 per cent.	
Pickled or cured.	do.	50.79 per cent.	
Veal:			
Fresh.	17.33 per cent.	34.65 per cent.	
Pickled or cured.	20 per cent.	50.79 per cent.	
Mutton.	29.59 per cent.	59.17 per cent.	
Lamb.	22.32 per cent.	39.06 per cent.	
Pork:			
Fresh.	3.90 per cent.	13.02 per cent.	
Ham, bacon, and shoulders.	5.64 per cent.	9.16 per cent.	
Pickled, salted, and other cured pork.	5.11 per cent.	8.31 per cent.	
Reindeer meat, imports in 1928, \$973.	13.16 per cent.	19.73 per cent.	
Venison.	18.78 per cent.	28.17 per cent.	
Fresh, not specifically provided for.	20 per cent.	52.49 per cent.	
Frog legs.	7.04 per cent.	10.55 per cent.	
Other canned meats.	20 per cent.	46.42 per cent.	
Other prepared or preserved, n. s. p. f.	do.	50.07 per cent.	
Other fresh or dried cured meats.	do.	35.97 per cent.	
Game, n. s. p. f.	30.77 per cent.	46.16 per cent.	
Edible offal (livers, sweetbreads, etc.).	20 per cent.	42.37 per cent.	
Lard (imports in 1928, \$666).	5.45 per cent.	16.17 per cent.	
Lard compounds and substitutes (imports in 1928, \$1,208).	29.14 per cent.	36.41 per cent.	
Milk:			
Fresh.	14.38 per cent.	37.39 per cent.	
Sour and buttermilk.	3.29 per cent.	6.75 per cent.	
Condensed milk in hermetically sealed containers—			
Sweetened.	18.22 per cent.	33.41 per cent.	
Unsweetened.	13.75 per cent.	24.74 per cent.	
All other.	14.93 per cent.	27.48 per cent.	

List of increases carried in the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, showing actual or computed ad valorem rates based on 1928 imports under Fordney-McCumber Act and Hawley-Smoot bill—Specific rates shown in some instances—Continued

SCHEDULE 7.—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS—continued

	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill
Milk—Continued.		
Powder—		
Whole.	17.11 per cent.	34.26 per cent.
Skimmed.	20.76 per cent.	41.52 per cent.
Malted milk and compounds, mixtures, or substitutes for milk and cream (imports of malted milk in 1928, \$463).	20 per cent.	35 per cent.
Butter.	33.30 per cent.	38.84 per cent.
Cheese:		
Having the eye formation of the Swiss or Emmenthaler type.	39.53 per cent.	42.16 per cent.
Not having the eye formation of the Swiss or Emmenthaler type.	28.73 per cent.	45.97 per cent.
Cream.	12.28 per cent.	34.75 per cent.
Cream, powder (imports of cream powder in 1928, \$1,826).	43.81 per cent.	77.16 per cent.
Birds:		
Poultry, live.	11.89 per cent.	31.70 per cent.
Poultry, dressed or undressed.	22.48 per cent.	37.46 per cent.
Game birds, dressed or undressed.	23.31 per cent.	29.13 per cent.
Game birds, canned.	35 per cent.	48.13 per cent.
Eggs:		
In shell.	27.55 per cent.	34.44 per cent.
Whole eggs, frozen or otherwise prepared or preserved.	38.83 per cent.	62.02 per cent.
Egg yolk, frozen or otherwise prepared or preserved.	29.84 per cent.	54.71 per cent.
Albumen, frozen or otherwise prepared or preserved.	38 per cent.	69.66 per cent.
Fish:		
Salmon, canned.	23.28 per cent.	25 per cent.
Kipper herring.	13.17 per cent.	15.81 per cent.
Cod, pickled or salted, skinned or boned.	12.43 per cent.	19.89 per cent.
Herring, smoked, skinned or boned.	23.37 per cent.	28.05 per cent.
Smoked finnan haddie.	25 per cent.	28.85 per cent.
Smoked fillets and portions of cod, haddock, hake, pollock, and cusk.	11.36 per cent.	27.27 per cent.
Other fish roe for food purposes.	30 per cent.	105.83 per cent.
Clams, clam juice, or either in combinations with other substances, packed in air-tight containers.	Free.	35 per cent.
Buckwheat.	5.53 per cent.	13.84 per cent.
Corn (production in 1928, 2,839,959,000 bushels; imports in 1928, 574,120 bushels; exports in 1928, 41,880,000 bushels).	13.96 per cent.	23.26 per cent.
Corn, cracked (imports in 1928, 9,258 bushels).	13.21 per cent.	22.02 per cent.
Corn meal, flour, grits, etc. (imports in 1928, \$283).	3.18 per cent.	5.65 per cent.
Oats (production in 1928, 1,449,531,000 bushels; imports in 1928, 489,368 bushels; exports in 1928, 16,242,000 bushels).	22.9 per cent.	24.43 per cent.
Rice paddy or rice having outer hull on.	20.21 per cent.	25.27 per cent.
Rice, uncleaned, or rice free of the outer hull.	23.62 per cent.	28.34 per cent.
Rice, clean.	46.19 per cent.	57.74 per cent.
Rice flour, meal, polish, bran and broken rice.	13.5 per cent.	16.88 per cent.
Oil cake and oil cake meal:		
Cottonseed.	Free.	22.16 per cent.
Linseed.	do.	13.84 per cent.
Coconut or copra.	do.	19.05 per cent.
Peanut.	do.	13.36 per cent.
Soybean.	do.	15.13 per cent.
All other.	do.	21.57 per cent.
Cherries:		
Maraschino, and other prepared or preserved.	40 per cent.	81.21 per cent.
Sulphured, or in brine, stemmed or pitted.	21.05 per cent.	66.67 per cent.
Citrous fruit peel:		
Orange, prepared or preserved in any manner.	43.47 per cent.	59.56 per cent.
Lemon.	54.19 per cent.	86.70 per cent.
Citron, candied or otherwise prepared or preserved.	35.05 per cent.	46.74 per cent.
Figs:		
Fresh, dried, or in brine.	23.53 per cent.	66.32 per cent.
Prepared or preserved in any manner.	35 per cent.	40 per cent.
Dates: Prepared or preserved (containers).	do.	41.64 per cent.
Lemons.	63.68 per cent.	79.60 per cent.
Limes.	39.16 per cent.	78.31 per cent.
Grapefruit, shaddocks, and pomelos.	31.92 per cent.	47.87 per cent.
Olives:		
In brine, ripe.	29.36 per cent.	44.03 per cent.
Dried, ripe.	36.73 per cent.	45.91 per cent.
Pineapples:		
In bulk.	7.78 per cent.	12.08 per cent.
In crates.	14.12 per cent.	25.10 per cent.
Plums, prunes, prunellas, dried, green, ripe, or in brine.	7.51 per cent.	30.04 per cent.
Avocados (import data not segregated).	35 per cent.	15 cents per pound.
Flower bulbs:		
Tulip, lily narcissus, and lily of valley pips.	9.07 per cent.	27.20 per cent.
Crocus corms.	7.72 per cent.	15.44 per cent.
Nuts:		
Almonds—		
Sweet, not shelled.	34.24 per cent.	39.65 per cent.
Sweet, shelled.	39.11 per cent.	46.09 per cent.
Bitter, shelled.	46.13 per cent.	54.36 per cent.
Paste.	11.20 per cent.	16 per cent.
Cream or Brazil nuts—		
Not shelled.	9.84 per cent.	14.76 per cent.
Shelled.	2.85 per cent.	12.83 per cent.

List of increases carried in the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, showing actual or computed ad valorem rates based on 1928 imports under Fordney-McCumber Act and Hawley-Smoot bill—Specific rates shown in some instances—Continued

SCHEDULE 7.—AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS AND PROVISIONS—continued

	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill
Nuts—Continued.		
Filberts—		
Not shelled	24.51 per cent.	49.01 per cent.
Shelled	29.16 per cent.	58.32 per cent.
Pignolia nuts	2.86 per cent.	28.57 per cent.
Pistachio nuts	2.83 per cent.	19.81 per cent.
Peanuts		
Not shelled	67.12 per cent.	95.09 per cent.
Shelled	72.74 per cent.	127.30 per cent.
Walnuts of all kinds—		
Not shelled	32.97 per cent.	41.21 per cent.
Shelled	43.67 per cent.	54.59 per cent.
Pecans—		
Not shelled	32.67 per cent.	54.45 per cent.
Shelled	16.74 per cent.	27.90 per cent.
Oil-bearing seeds:		
Flaxseed or linseed	22.50 per cent.	26.57 per cent.
Soybeans	13.77 per cent.	55.06 per cent.
Grass seeds:		
Alfalfa	23.52 per cent.	47.03 per cent.
Alsike clover	20.45 per cent.	40.90 per cent.
Crimson clover	10.60 per cent.	21.19 per cent.
Red clover	20.69 per cent.	41.37 per cent.
White clover	15.73 per cent.	31.46 per cent.
Other clovers, not specially provided for	36.18 per cent.	54.26 per cent.
Hairy vetch	31.66 per cent.	47.49 per cent.
Spring vetch, common	17.21 per cent.	25.81 per cent.
Canada bluegrass	18.16 per cent.	45.40 per cent.
Kentucky bluegrass	18.75 per cent.	46.93 per cent.
Orchard grass	16.14 per cent.	40.35 per cent.
Ryegrass	27.68 per cent.	41.52 per cent.
Garden seeds:		
Cabbage	19.71 per cent.	23.65 per cent.
Radish	24.62 per cent.	36.92 per cent.
Turnip (English turnips)	37.53 per cent.	46.91 per cent.
Rutabaga (Swedish turnip seeds)	43.32 per cent.	54.15 per cent.
Beans:		
Green	13.87 per cent.	97.14 per cent.
Dried	38.36 per cent.	65.76 per cent.
Canned	22.25 per cent.	33.38 per cent.
Cowpeas	Free	61.61 per cent.
Sugar beets	12.62 per cent.	14.13 per cent.
Mushrooms:		
Canned	45 per cent.	70.31 per cent.
Dried	do.	57.90 per cent.
Peas:		
Green	20.08 per cent.	60.25 per cent.
Dried	26.02 per cent.	45.54 per cent.
Split	28.87 per cent.	57.75 per cent.
Onions	47.11 per cent.	117.78 per cent.
Potatoes, white or Irish	35.11 per cent.	52.66 per cent.
Tomatoes:		
In natural state	15.71 per cent.	94.28 per cent.
Canned	15 per cent.	50 per cent.
Paste	40 per cent.	Do.
Turnips	21.60 per cent.	44.99 per cent.
Cabbage	25 per cent.	141.79 per cent.
Acorns, and chicory, and dandelion roots, crude	67.67 per cent.	90.23 per cent.
Chocolate:		
Sweetened, minimum rate	20 per cent.	40 per cent.
Sweetened, ad valorem rate	17.50 per cent.	33.18 per cent.
Unsweetened	21.31 per cent.	32 per cent.
Cocoa:		
Sweetened, minimum rate	23.57 per cent.	40 per cent.
Sweetened, ad valorem rate	17.50 per cent.	Do.
Unsweetened	26.22 per cent.	39.32 per cent.
Hay	44.25 per cent.	61.94 per cent.
Straw	17.77 per cent.	20.85 per cent.
Broomcorn	Free	17.17 per cent.
Lupulin	66.15 per cent.	132.29 per cent.
Spices and spice seed:		
Mustard seed (whole)	18.45 per cent.	36.90 per cent.
Capsicum or red or Cayenne pepper, unground	13.01 per cent.	32.53 per cent.
Paprika, unground	7.23 per cent.	18.06 per cent.
Pepper, ground	21.59 per cent.	34.55 per cent.
Long-staple cotton	Free	7 cents per pound.

SCHEDULE 8.—SPIRITS, WINES, AND OTHER BEVERAGES

Angostura bitters	54.69 per cent.	105.18 per cent.
Juices of lemons, limes, oranges, or other citrous fruits, for beverage purposes.	Free	56.73 per cent.

SCHEDULE 9.—COTTON MANUFACTURES

Cotton yarn:		
Unbleached singles	24.01 per cent.	29.06 per cent.
Bleached, dyed, colored, combed, or plied	28.23 per cent.	33.77 per cent.
Colored with vat dyes—		
Yarn No. 84	34 per cent.	35.20 per cent.
Yarn Nos. 95-98-200	do.	37 per cent.
Countable cotton cloth:		
Unbleached	27.90 per cent.	35.58 per cent.
Bleached	31.12 per cent.	39.73 per cent.
Printed, dyed, colored, or woven figured	26.99 per cent.	29.82 per cent.

List of increases carried in the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, showing actual or computed ad valorem rates based on 1928 imports under Fordney-McCumber Act and Hawley-Smoot bill—Specific rates shown in some instances—Continued

SCHEDULE 9.—COTTON MANUFACTURES—continued

	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill
Countable cotton cloth—Continued.		
Colored with vat dyes—		
Yarn No. 81	44 per cent.	44.35 per cent.
Yarn No. 82	do.	44.70 per cent.
Yarn No. 83	do.	45.05 per cent.
Yarn No. 84	do.	45.40 per cent.
Yarn No. 85	do.	45.75 per cent.
Yarn No. 86	do.	46.10 per cent.
Yarn No. 88	do.	46.80 per cent.
Yarn No. 89	do.	47.15 per cent.
Yarn No. 90	do.	47.50 per cent.
Yarn Nos. 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 110, 112, 122, 240.	do.	Do.
Woven with 8 or more harnesses or with Jacquard lappet, or swivel attachment.	41.23 per cent.	46.26 per cent.
Woven with drop boxes.	36.83 per cent.	40.23 per cent.
Containing silk or rayon, printed, dyed, or or colored or woven figured.	39.84 per cent.	43.74 per cent.
Containing silk or rayon, woven with 8 or or more harnesses or with Jacquard, lappet, or swivel attachments.	44.09 per cent.	54.13 per cent.
Containing silk or rayon, woven with drop boxes.	35.34 per cent.	37.75 per cent.
Special cloths, filled, coated, or waterproofed:		
Tracing cloth	29.46 per cent.	30 per cent.
Oilcloth (except for floors)	27.87 per cent.	Do.
Tapestries and other Jacquard-figured upholstery cloths.	45 per cent.	55 per cent.
Cotton pile fabrics and manufactures of:		
Velvets and velveteens	50 per cent.	62.50 per cent.
Plush and velvet ribbons	do.	Do.
Quilts: Jacquard-figured	25 per cent.	40 per cent.
Blankets, not Jacquard-figured	do.	53.09 per cent.
Cotton small wares: Loom harness, healds, or collets of vegetable fiber.	34.80 per cent.	35 per cent.
Cotton belting and rope for machinery	30 per cent.	32 per cent.
Gloves, knit on a warp-knitting machine	50 per cent.	60 per cent.
Handkerchiefs and mufflers, bleached:		
Not hemmed, yarn No. 80	40 per cent.	41 per cent.
Not hemmed, yarn No. 82	do.	41.70 per cent.
Containing yarn	42.35 per cent.	50.69 per cent.
Printed, dyed, colored, or woven figured, not containing silk.	47.45 per cent.	51.69 per cent.
Containing silk	52.74 per cent.	56.56 per cent.
Clothing and wearing apparel, not knit:		
Men's shirts	35 per cent.	37.50 per cent.
Corsets and brassieres	do.	Do.
Rag rugs	do.	75 per cent.
Cotton, wiping rags	Free	3 cents per pound.

SCHEDULE 10.—FLAX, HEMP, JUTE, AND MANUFACTURES OF

Flax, unmanufactured:		
Straw	3.97 per cent.	5.95 per cent.
Not hackled	3.78 per cent.	5.60 per cent.
Hackled, including dressed line	4.30 per cent.	6.44 per cent.
Tow	4.09 per cent.	5.45 per cent.
Noils	9.01 per cent.	12.01 per cent.
Hemp, unmanufactured:		
Not hackled	7.40 per cent.	14.81 per cent.
Hackled	8.73 per cent.	15.28 per cent.
Tow	7.86 per cent.	15.71 per cent.
Crin vegetal or palm-leaf fiber	33.38 per cent.	44.50 per cent.
Flax, hemp, or ramie yarns	28.77 per cent.	34.86 per cent.
Thread, twine, and cord of flax, hemp, or ramie, in the gray, boiled, bleached, dyed, or otherwise treated.	29.98 per cent.	36.28 per cent.
Gill nettings, nets, webs, and seines	42.85 per cent.	45 per cent.
Hose for conducting liquids or gases, of vegetable fiber.	33.06 per cent.	42.14 per cent.
Linen and manufactures of:		
Table damask	40 per cent.	45 per cent.
Sets, tablecloths, and napkins	do.	Do.
Handkerchiefs, hemmed or hemstitched	45 per cent.	50 per cent.
Linoleum, inlaid	35 per cent.	42 per cent.
Mats of cocoa fiber or rattan	59.07 per cent.	78.76 per cent.
Matting of cocoa fiber or rattan	23.83 per cent.	29.79 per cent.

SCHEDULE 11.—WOOL AND MANUFACTURES OF

Wool for manufacture, not improved:		
Carpet—		
In the grease	35.72 per cent.	39.30 per cent.
On the skin	50.86 per cent.	70 per cent. plus.
Washed	18 cents per pound.	24 cents per pound.
Scoured	59.06 per cent.	66.44 per cent.
Clothing—		
In the grease	42.66 per cent.	46.79 per cent.
Washed	42.46 per cent.	46.59 per cent.
On the skin	39.96 per cent.	42.62 per cent.
Scoured	58.40 per cent.	69.71 per cent.
Combing—		
In the grease	43.01 per cent.	47.17 per cent.
Washed	52.33 per cent.	57.40 per cent.

List of increases carried in the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, showing actual or computed ad valorem rates based on 1928 imports under Fordney-McCumber Act and Hawley-Smoot bill—Specific rates shown in some instances—Continued

SCHEDULE 11.—WOOL AND MANUFACTURES OF—continued

	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill
Wool for manufacture not improved—Contd.		
Combing—Continued.		
On the skin	34.71 per cent.	37.02 per cent.
Scoured	45.93 per cent.	54.82 per cent.
Hair of the Angora goat (mohair):		
In the grease	53.29 per cent.	58.44 per cent.
Washed	31 cents per pound.	34 cents per pound.
On the skin	30 cents per pound.	32 cents per pound.
Scoured	10.62 per cent.	12.33 per cent.
Hair of the Cashmere goat, Alpaca, and other like animals:		
In the grease	38.17 per cent.	41.87 per cent.
Washed	31 cents per pound.	34 cents per pound.
On the skin	57.26 per cent.	61.08 per cent.
Scoured	18.25 per cent.	21.79 per cent.
Wool wastes and by-products:		
Top waste, slubbing waste, roving and ring waste.	47.32 per cent.	56.47 per cent.
Garnetted waste.	34.06 per cent.	36.90 per cent.
Noils, carbonized.	33.03 per cent.	41.29 per cent.
Noils, uncarbonized.	26.64 per cent.	32.25 per cent.
Thread or yarn waste.	27.25 per cent.	42.58 per cent.
All others n. s. p. f.	33.54 per cent.	50.32 per cent.
Shoddy and wool extract.	16 cents per pound.	24 cents per pound.
Wool rags.	26.12 per cent.	62.68 per cent.
Partially manufactured wool:		
Tops of mohair.	75.06 per cent.	81.73 per cent.
Tops of wool and other hair.	50.16 per cent.	53.82 per cent.
Other wool advanced.	134.36 per cent.	148.23 per cent.
Yarns of wool and hair:		
Mohair—		
Valued not over 30 cents per pound.	132.77 per cent.	206.30 per cent.
Valued over 30 cents and not over \$1 per pound.	80.18 per cent.	85.21 per cent.
Valued over \$1 per pound.	54.33 per cent.	65.93 per cent.
Wool and other hair—		
Valued over 30 cents and not over \$1 per pound.	79.78 per cent.	84.76 per cent.
Valued over \$1 per pound.	52.76 per cent.	64.17 per cent.
Wool, dress goods and other light-weight fabrics of wool, weighing not over 4 ounces per square yard:		
Woven fabrics of mohair, valued over 80 cents per pound, mohair content.	65.09 per cent.	76.80 per cent.
Woven, warp of cotton or other vegetable fiber.	68.85 per cent.	80.94 per cent.
Wool, worsteds:		
Valued over 80 cents per pound (wool content).	68.12 per cent.	80.13 per cent.
Warp of cotton or other vegetable fiber.	68.77 per cent.	80.86 per cent.
Wool, woollens:		
Valued not over 80 cents per pound.	110.76 per cent.	132.17 per cent.
Valued over 80 cents per pound (wool content).	64.15 per cent.	75.72 per cent.
Warp of cotton or other vegetable fiber.	70.57 per cent.	82.86 per cent.
Cloth and other heavy-weight fabrics of wool, woven fabrics of mohair:		
Valued not over 60 cents per pound.	80.24 per cent.	133.33 per cent.
Valued over 60 cents per pound (mohair content).	70.01 per cent.	82.23 per cent.
Cloth worsteds:		
Valued not over 60 cents per pound.	82.10 per cent.	137.70 per cent.
Valued over 60 cents and not over 80 cents per pound.	99.04 per cent.	116.27 per cent.
Valued over 80 cents per pound (wool content).	65.89 per cent.	77.65 per cent.
Cloth, woollens:		
Valued not over 60 cents per pound.	83.07 per cent.	139.72 per cent.
Valued over 60 cents, and not over 80 cents per pound.	100.62 per cent.	118.40 per cent.
Valued over 80 cents per pound (wool content).	70.71 per cent.	83.02 per cent.
Pile fabrics of wool or hair:		
Plushes, velvets, and other pile fabrics.	66.01 per cent.	67.61 per cent.
Manufactures of.	64.46 per cent.	65.90 per cent.
Blankets and similar articles:		
Valued not over 50 cents per pound.	70.32 per cent.	103.20 per cent.
Valued over 50 cents and not over \$1 per pound.	67.80 per cent.	75.23 per cent.
Valued over \$1 and not over \$1.50 per pound.	60.36 per cent.	65.39 per cent.
Valued over \$1.50 per pound.	54.89 per cent.	56.09 per cent.
Felts, not woven, wholly or in chief value of wool:		
Valued not over 50 cents per pound.	68.80 per cent.	99.61 per cent.
Valued over 50 cents and not over \$1.50 per pound.	61.25 per cent.	64.16 per cent.
Valued over \$1.50 per pound.	55.83 per cent.	57.13 per cent.
Wool, small wares:		
Fabrics with fast edges not over 12 inches wide and articles made therefrom of woolen mohair (wool content).	64.24 per cent.	65.82 per cent.
Tubings, garters, suspenders, braces, cords, and tassels (wool content).	65.85 per cent.	67.62 per cent.
Wool knit goods:		
Fabrics in the piece—		
Valued not over \$1 per pound.	80.56 per cent.	84.61 per cent.
Valued over \$1 per pound.	58.51 per cent.	59.46 per cent.
Wool knit hosiery:		
Valued at not more than \$1.75 per dozen pair.	53.80 per cent.	55.88 per cent.
Valued at more than \$1.75 per dozen pair.	61.87 per cent.	63.18 per cent.

List of increases carried in the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, showing actual or computed ad valorem rates based on 1928 imports under Fordney-McCumber Act and Hawley-Smoot bill—Specific rates shown in some instances—Continued

SCHEDULE 11.—WOOL AND MANUFACTURES OF—continued

	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill
Wool knit gloves and mittens:		
Valued at not more than \$1.75 per dozen pair.	57.54 per cent.	60.04 per cent.
Valued at more than \$1.75 per dozen pair.	66.66 per cent.	68.51 per cent.
Wool knit underwear:		
Valued not over \$1.75 per pound.	52.31 per cent.	54.78 per cent.
Valued over \$1.75 per pound.	61.21 per cent.	62.45 per cent.
Wool knit outerwear:		
Valued not over \$1 per pound.	89.57 per cent.	105.43 per cent.
Valued over \$1 and not over \$2 per pound.	69.80 per cent.	72.28 per cent.
Valued over \$2 per pound.	58.99 per cent.	59.99 per cent.
Wool wearing apparel, not knit or crocheted:		
Hat bodies—		
Valued not over \$2 per pound.	56.68 per cent.	102.80 per cent.
Valued over \$2 and not over \$4 per pound.	57.84 per cent.	92.12 per cent.
Valued over \$4 per pound.	58.36 per cent.	82.44 per cent.
Wool hats:		
Valued not over \$2 per pound.	55.41 per cent.	203.09 per cent.
Valued over \$2 and not over \$4 per pound.	55.95 per cent.	156.82 per cent.
Valued over \$4 per pound.	58.03 per cent.	111.63 per cent.
Wool clothing and wearing apparel:		
Valued not over \$2 per pound.	56.01 per cent.	67.02 per cent.
Valued over \$2 and not over \$4 per pound.	55.34 per cent.	56.37 per cent.
Valued over \$4 per pound.	56.29 per cent.	56.99 per cent.
Carpets and rugs:		
Oriental and similar carpets and rugs, made on power-driven loom.	55 per cent.	60 per cent.
Oriental and similar carpets and rugs, not made on power-driven loom (hand-made), were reduced 55 to 53.24 per cent.		
Chenille Axminster.	do.	Do.
Machine made, not specially provided for, Wilton and others.	40 per cent.	Do.
Fabrics containing 17 per cent or more in weight of wool (but not in chief value thereof).	50 per cent.	86.31 per cent.

SCHEDULE 12.—SILK MANUFACTURES

	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill
Sewing silk, twist, floss, and silk thread or yarns, n. s. p. f.	35 per cent.	40 per cent.
Woven fabrics in piece (broad silks) Jacquard-figured.	55 per cent.	65 per cent.
Silk pile fabrics:		
Velvets.	60 per cent.	Do.
Ribbons.	55 per cent.	Do.
Silk wearing apparel: Men's shirts and collars not embroidered.	60 per cent.	Do.
Manufactures of silk n. s. p. f.	do.	Do.

SCHEDULE 13.—RAYON MANUFACTURES

	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill
Rayon:		
Yarn, weighing less than 150 deniers.	45 per cent.	51.07 per cent.
Yarn, two or more yarns twisted together, weighing less than 150 deniers.	46.13 per cent.	50 per cent.
Artificial horsehair: Two or more yarns twisted together, weighing less than 150 deniers.	47.62 per cent.	Do.
Rayon waste (including noils): Staple fiber (cut rayon filaments other than waste).	20 per cent.	25 per cent.
Spun rayon yarn:		
Singles.	45 per cent.	54.62 per cent.
Two or more yarns twisted together.	47.71 per cent.	69.17 per cent.
Knit goods of rayon: Gloves, mittens, hose, half hose, underwear, outerwear, and articles of all kinds.	68.34 per cent.	73.34 per cent.
Clothing and articles of wearing apparel, and manufactures of rayon not specially provided for, increased from 45 cents per pound plus 60 per cent to 45 cents per pound plus 65 per cent.		

SCHEDULE 14.—PAPER AND BOOKS

	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill
Pulpboard in rolls for use in the manufacture of wallboard.	5 per cent.	10 per cent.
Pulp, manufactures of.	25 per cent.	30 per cent.
Papers:		
Tissue, stereotype, copying, india, bible, condenser, carbon, bibulous, pottery, and similar papers, not specially provided for, weighing not more than 6 pounds to the ream.	24.85 per cent.	29.85 per cent.
Surface coated—		
Not specially provided for, covered with metal or its solutions and weighing less than 15 pounds to the ream.	28.24 per cent.	29.24 per cent.
Decorated, covered with a design, pattern, or character.	12.72 per cent.	22.72 per cent.
If embossed, printed, or covered with metal or its solutions, gelatin or flock.	28.78 per cent.	31.78 per cent.
Wrapping paper:		
Decorated or covered with a design, pattern, or character.	15.43 per cent.	25.43 per cent.
If embossed, printed, or covered with metal or its solutions, gelatin or flock.	28.87 per cent.	31.87 per cent.
Gummed paper: Simplex, decalcomania paper, not printed.	22.03 per cent.	32.03 per cent.
Decalcomanias, in ceramic colors, weighing not over 100 pounds per 1,000 sheets.	32.25 per cent.	45.80 per cent.

List of increases carried in the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, showing actual or computed ad valorem rates based on 1928 imports under Fordney-McCumber Act and Hawley-Smoot bill—Specific rates shown in some instances—Continued

SCHEDULE 14.—PAPER AND BOOKS—continued

	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill
Lithographic printing matter:		
Cigar labels, flaps—		
Printed in less than 8 colors, not in metal leaf.	22.79 per cent.	27.34 per cent.
Printed in 8 or more colors, not in metal leaf.	34.35 per cent.	39.25 per cent.
Post cards (except American views) not exceeding 0.008 inch in thickness.	28.77 per cent.	34.53 per cent.
Post cards, exceeding 0.008 inch in thickness, and not exceeding 0.020 inch in thickness, in dimensions less than 35 square inches.	16.82 per cent.	24.77 per cent.
All other lithographically printed matter not specially provided for, not exceeding 0.008 inch in thickness.	26.94 per cent.	32.32 per cent.

SCHEDULE 15.—SUNDRIES

Asbestos	30 per cent.	40 per cent.
Shingles—		
Coated	25 per cent.	25.13 per cent.
Not coated	do.	52.63 per cent.
Slate, wood, or lumber of—		
Uncoated	do.	Do.
Coated	do.	25.13 per cent.
Fabrics, woven (including brake and clutch linings and facings).	30 per cent.	40 per cent.
Packing fabric (including expanding, block, and cloth packing).	do.	Do.
Hat braids:		
Bleached, dyed, colored, or stained straw, Manila hemp, all others	20 per cent.	25 per cent.
Willow sheets or squares	do.	Do.
Hats, blocked or trimmed:		
Straw	49.96 per cent.	90.78 per cent.
Palm leaf	50 per cent.	81.26 per cent.
Men's sewed straw hats	88 per cent.	159.20 per cent.
Others sewed	60 per cent.	Do.
Brooms, made of broomcorn, straw, wooden fiber or twigs.	15 per cent.	25 per cent.
Brushes:		
Toothbrushes	45 per cent.	72.54 per cent.
Other toilet brushes	do.	61.14 per cent.
Paint brushes	do.	50 per cent.
Other brushes	do.	Do.
Having pyroxilin handles	60 per cent.	123.39 per cent.
Handles of pyroxilin for brushes	do.	101.07 per cent.
Buttons, agate	15 per cent.	358.11 per cent.
Cork:		
Stoppers—		
Natural cork, over 3/4 inch in diameter at large end.	18.50 per cent.	23.12 per cent.
3/4 inch or less at large end	15.84 per cent.	19.65 per cent.
Insulation	30 per cent.	61.45 per cent.
Granulated or ground	25 per cent.	49.87 per cent.
Artificial composition, or compressed cork, in slabs, blocks, or planks, rods, or sticks.	do.	Do.
Manufactures of cork not specially provided for.	30 per cent.	45 per cent.
Firecrackers	42.95 per cent.	134.20 per cent.
Fishing rods and reels	45 per cent.	55 per cent.
Candles, wax	20 per cent.	27.50 per cent.
Combs:		
Hard rubber	35 per cent.	60.26 per cent.
Composed of horn or of horn and metal	50 per cent.	59.86 per cent.
Insulators: Electrical and other articles of synthetic phenolic resin, etc., not specially provided for.	30 per cent.	110.71 per cent.
Musical instruments:		
Cases for	40 per cent.	50 per cent.
Pipe organs	do.	60 per cent.
Violins, assembled	66.45 per cent.	74.31 per cent.
Violin bow hair	Free	40 per cent.
Phonograph needles	45 per cent.	131.09 per cent.
Sponges	15 per cent.	25 per cent.
Photographic dry plates	do.	Do.
Tobacco pipes and smoking articles:		
Tobacco pipes, bowls known as stummels	60 per cent.	423 per cent.
Tobacco pipes other than common tobacco pipes of clay.	do.	103.51 per cent.
Cigar and cigarette holders, not specially provided for.	do.	205 per cent.
Embroidered articles:		
Hose and half hose	75 per cent.	90 per cent.
Imitation horsehair	do.	Do.
Wearing apparel of wool	do.	Do.
Wearing apparel of rayon	do.	Do.
Wool blankets	do.	Do.
Embroideries of gold and silver not specially provided for.	do.	Do.
Embroideries of cotton, flax, hemp, silk	do.	Do.
Embroidered articles of wearing apparel, cotton, flax, hemp, and silk.	do.	Do.
Other articles or fabrics embroidered or tamboured.	do.	Do.
Drawn work of cotton, flax, silk	do.	Do.
Handkerchiefs, embroidered:		
Cotton	do.	100.85 per cent.
Silk	do.	98.89 per cent.
Hides: Cattle, buffalo, kip skin, and calfskin, dry or salted.	Free	10 per cent.

List of increases carried in the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, showing actual or computed ad valorem rates based on 1928 imports under Fordney-McCumber Act and Hawley-Smoot bill—Specific rates shown in some instances—Continued

SCHEDULE 15.—SUNDRIES—continued

	Fordney-McCumber Act (1922)	Hawley-Smoot bill
Leather:		
Upper leather, cattle—		
Grains and finished splits	Free	15 per cent.
Wax and rough splits	do.	Do.
Calf and kip	do.	Do.
Patent upper	do.	Do.
Shoe, sole, harness, and belting leather	do.	12.50 per cent.
Boots and shoes	do.	20 per cent.
Shoe laces, finished or unfinished	do.	15 per cent.
Bags, baskets, satchels, pocketbooks, belts, jewel boxes, portfolios, and other boxes and cases not specially provided for.	30 per cent.	35 per cent.
Bags, fitted with traveling bottle, drinking, dining, or luncheon, sewing, manicure, and similar sets.	do.	Do.
Pencils:		
Mechanical, made of base metal not plated with gold, silver, or platinum.	25.11 per cent.	45.11 per cent.
Not specially provided for	32.62 per cent.	47.62 per cent.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BELL, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for two weeks on account of important business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 317. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant certain oil and gas prospecting permits and leases; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 319. An act granting an increase of pension to Irene Rucker Sheridan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 497. An act to provide for the erection and operation of public bathhouses at Hot Springs, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 543. An act to increase the pay of mail carriers in the village delivery service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

S. 557. An act to authorize the disposition of certain public lands in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 612. An act for the relief of Charles Parshall, Fort Peck Indian allottee, of the Fort Peck Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1183. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain land in the Hot Springs National Park, Ark., to the P. F. Connelly Paying Co.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1299. An act for the relief of C. M. Williamson, C. E. Liljenquist, Lottie Redman, and H. N. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3088. An act for the relief of R. B. Miller; to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 3171. An act for the relief of Edward C. Compton; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3386. An act giving the consent and approval of Congress to the Rio Grande compact signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., on February 12, 1929; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

S. 3646. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Willoughby Osterhaus; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 4196. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the St. Francis River in Craighead County, Ark.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 4211. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the elimination of the Michigan Avenue grade crossing in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1927; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 4222. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell by private or public sale a tract of land acquired for public purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 4223. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the elimination of grade crossings of steam railroads in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1927; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 4224. An act to provide for the operation and maintenance of bathing pools under the jurisdiction of the Director of Public Buildings and Parks of the National Capital; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 4226. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell at public or private sale certain real property owned by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 4243. An act to provide for the closing of certain streets and alleys in the Reno section of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4138. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1929, entitled "An act to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries";

H. R. 6874. An act to authorize exchanges of lands with owners of private land holdings within the Petrified Forest National Monument, Ariz.;

H. R. 8531. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8562. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.; and

H. R. 9895. An act to establish the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 549. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

S. 4098. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Browning, Mont., in the extension of the high-school building to be available to Indian children of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation;

S. 4173. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Carrollton, Ky.; and

S. 4174. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the French Broad River on the Dandridge-Newport Road, in Jefferson County, Tenn.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Lyman Van Winkle;

H. R. 1794. An act to authorize the payment of an indemnity to the owners of the British steamship *Kyleakin* for damages sustained as a result of a collision between that vessel and the U. S. S. *William O'Brien*;

H. R. 1954. An act for the relief of A. O. Gibbens;

H. R. 2902. An act to authorize the sale of the Government property acquired for a post-office site in Binghamton, N. Y.;

H. R. 3246. An act to authorize the sale of the Government property acquired for a post-office site at Akron, Ohio;

H. R. 3717. An act to add certain lands to the Fremont National Forest in the State of Oregon;

H. R. 4138. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1929, entitled "An act to enable the mothers and widows of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to these cemeteries";

H. R. 6564. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6874. An act to authorize exchanges of lands with owners of private-land holdings, within the Petrified Forest National Monument, Ariz.;

H. R. 7069. An act for the relief of the heirs of Viktor Petterson;

H. R. 7832. An act to reorganize the administration of Federal prisons; to authorize the Attorney General to contract for the care of United States prisoners; to establish Federal jails, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8299. An act authorizing the establishment of a national hydraulic laboratory in the Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce and the construction of a building therefor;

H. R. 8562. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.

H. R. 8578. An act to sell the present post-office site and building at Dover, Del.;

H. R. 8918. An act authorizing conveyance to the city of Trenton, N. J., of title to a portion of the site of the present Federal building in that city;

H. R. 9324. An act to dedicate for street purposes a portion of the old post-office site at Wichita, Kans.;

H. R. 9325. An act to authorize the United States Veterans' Bureau to pave the road running north and south immediately east of and adjacent to Hospital No. 90 at Muskogee, Okla., and to authorize the use of \$4,950 of funds appropriated for hospital purposes, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9407. An act to amend the act of Congress approved May 29, 1928, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to accept title to certain real estate, subject to a reservation of mineral rights in favor of the Blackfeet Tribe of Indians;

H. R. 9437. An act to authorize a necessary increase in the White House police force;

H. R. 9758. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close certain portions of streets and alleys for public-school purposes; and

H. R. 9845. An act to authorize the transfer of Government-owned land at Dodge City, Kans., for public-building purposes.

H. R. 9895. An act to establish the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes;

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 13, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Tuesday, May 13, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(10.30 a. m.)

To construe the contract labor provisions of the immigration act of 1917 with reference to instrumental musicians (H. R. 10816).

COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

(10.30 a. m.)

Authorizing appropriations for the completion of the Amarillo helium plant (H. R. 10200).

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(10.30 a. m.)

To amend section 4530 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (H. R. 6789).

To amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion, and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea" (H. R. 6790).

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(10.30 a. m.)

To consider branch, chain, and group banking as provided in House Resolution 141.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

461. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1930 and 1931, amounting in all, \$50,000 (H. Doc. No. 395); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

462. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report concerning the claim of T. G. Hayes, formerly private, Company A, One hundred and forty-second Machine Gun Battalion, Camp Bureaugard, La., in the sum of \$40; to the Committee on Claims.

463. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of the Jay Street Terminal; to the Committee on Claims.

464. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing for the transfer of certain land described therein from said Shipping Board to the Treasury Department for the enlargement of the Federal building site at Hoboken, N. J.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. STALKER: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4015. A bill to provide for the revocation and suspension of operators' and chauffeurs' licenses and registration certificates; to require proof of ability to respond in damages for injuries caused by the operation of motor vehicles; to prescribe the form of and conditions in insurance policies covering the liability of motor-vehicle operators; to subject such policies to the approval of the commissioner of insurance; to constitute the director of traffic the agent of nonresident owners and operators of motor vehicles operated in the District of Columbia for the purpose of service of process; to provide for the report of accidents; to authorize the director of traffic to make rules for the administration of this statute; and to prescribe penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1426). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAWLEY: Committee on Ways and Means. H. J. Res. 328. A joint resolution authorizing the immediate appropriation of certain amounts authorized to be appropriated by the settlement of war claims act of 1928; without amendment (Rept. No. 1427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BEERS: Committee on Printing. H. Con. Res. 31. A concurrent resolution to print 10,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the House Committee on the Judiciary on joint resolutions proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States relating to the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors within the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. S. J. Res. 49. A joint resolution to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of the Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1430). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 220. A resolution providing for the appointment of a committee to investigate Communist propaganda in the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1431). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. S. 363. An act for the relief of Charles W. Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: Committee on Claims. H. R. 457. A bill for the relief of Simonas Razauskas; with amendment (Rept. No. 1418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5212. A bill for the relief of George Charles Walthers; with amendment (Rept. No. 1419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6642. A bill for the relief of John Magee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6694. A bill for the relief of P. M. Nigro; without amendment (Rept. No. 1421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8127. A bill for the relief of J. W. Nelson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4110. A bill to credit the accounts of Maj. Benjamin L. Jacobson, Finance Department, United States Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 1423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8677. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; with amendment (Rept. No. 1424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 12302. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain

widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; without amendment (Rept. No. 1425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11737) granting an increase of pension to E. Jennette Redding, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HARE: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 5723. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Velie Motors Corporation (Rept. No. 1428). Laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 12302) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; to the Committee on the Whole House and ordered to be printed.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 12303) to pay 25 per cent of the face value of adjusted-compensation certificates to veterans of the World War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12304) to pay 50 per cent of the face value of adjusted-compensation certificates to veterans of the World War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 12305) to amend sections 45 and 206 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, as amended by acts of March 3, 1925, and June 14, 1926; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 12306) to repeal Public Act No. 175 entitled "An act to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910," approved April 29, 1930; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 12307) to provide for the appointment of one additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 12308) to provide for the construction of a mill to manufacture distinctive paper for United States securities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 12309) to amend the World War adjusted-compensation act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLACKBURN: A bill (H. R. 12310) for the relief of Robert Griffith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12311) granting a pension to Nannie Floyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 12312) granting a pension to Grace A. Coates; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 12313) for the relief of Edward N. Sonnenberg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 12314) granting an increase of pension to Addie E. Churchill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COYLE: A bill (H. R. 12315) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Wise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DE PRIEST: A bill (H. R. 12316) for settlement of claim of Allen Holmes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 12317) authorizing the President to order Harry W. Kerns before a retiring board for a hearing of his case, and upon the findings of such a board determine whether or not he be placed on the retired list with the rank and pay held by him at the time of his resignation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 12318) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Garrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 12319) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Dawson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IRWIN: A bill (H. R. 12320) granting a pension to Mary E. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12321) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth E. Fouke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 12322) granting a pension to Mattie Lowry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 12323) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Grange; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINZER: A bill (H. R. 12324) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Wenger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12325) granting an increase of pension to Michael Quinn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12326) granting a pension to Mary Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 12327) granting a pension to John Deaton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LETTS: A bill (H. R. 12328) for the relief of Anna Gerken; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 12329) granting an increase of pension to Sallie Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 12330) for the relief of Willie B. Hunter; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 12331) granting an increase in pension to William S. Loesch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12332) granting a pension to Elizabeth D. R. Prouty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REID of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 12333) granting an increase of pension to Mary Byard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 12334) granting an increase of pension to Charles Osborne; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 12335) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12336) granting a pension to Albert Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 12337) for the relief of William J. Carr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 12338) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mary A. McCourt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 12339) for the relief of Lewis E. Green; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12340) granting a pension to Michael J. Carroll; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7245. Petition of American Legion of the District of Columbia, protesting against the location of any permanent airport in the vicinity of Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

7246. By Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa: Petition of the Ida County, Iowa, Woman's Christian Temperance Union Institute and the Milford, Iowa, Woman's Christian Temperance Union Institute, requesting Congress to enact a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures establishing higher standards before production for films that are to be licensed for interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7247. By Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania: Petition of residents of the thirty-sixth congressional district, urging the passage of the Muscle Shoals bill at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

7248. By Mr. GLOVER: Petition of Allen Hearin Post, No. 32, American Legion, Pine Bluff, Ark., urging the passage of the Rankin bill in its present form; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

7249. By Mr. HUDSON: Petition of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Detroit Branch, Detroit, Mich., urging the immediate payment of the adjusted-compensation certificates, commonly referred to as the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7250. Also, resolution of the board of directors of the Detroit Council of Churches commending the President of the United States upon his wisdom and courage in recommending the enactment of legislation to correct the evils now existing because of the nonenforcement of law, and urging early enactment of legislation for the correction thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7251. Also, petition of presbytery of Lansing, Mich., of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, urging the enactment of legislation for the Federal supervision of motion pictures, requiring higher standards for films which are to be licensed for interstate and international use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7252. By Mr. HULL of Wisconsin: Resolution of Alaska Native Brotherhood, regarding conditions of natives of southeastern Alaska; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

7253. By Mr. LUCE: Petition of residents of Massachusetts indorsing the passage of bill to except dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia, the Territories, and insular possessions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7254. By Mr. NEWHALL: Resolution of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Fort Thomas, Ky., signed by Kate Shaw, president, and L. M. Grimm, secretary, requesting the House of Representatives to pass legislation providing for Federal supervision of motion pictures that are to be licensed for interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7255. By Mrs. OWEN: Petition of W. H. Arnold and 84 other persons, of Orlando, Fla., and vicinity, in behalf of Senate bill 476 and House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension to the men who served in the armed forces of the United States during the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

7256. By Mr. SWANSON: Petition of Council Bluffs Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring Federal supervision of motion pictures used in interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, May 13, 1930

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, who renewest the face of the earth with Thy breath, so gentle and potent, reviving for us in the springtime the grace and beauty that had fled, make us to partake of other things than those made known to eyes of sense—messages of splendor, baffling and alluring, revealed through the soul's east window of divine surprise. Give us this day a larger charity, a deeper self-knowledge, a growing sense of moral acquisition that can only come through high endeavor for the better, purer things of life.

Pity and pardon us for what we have missed and might have attained, strengthen our weakness, arm us with trust in Thy mercy which fails not, in Thy patience which waits without weariness, that we may press forward toward the mark of our high calling which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. FESS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2400. An act to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in certain areas of the National Capital;

S. 3498. An act to aid the Grand Army of the Republic in its Memorial Day services, May 30, 1930;

S. 4057. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to extend the time for cutting and removing timber upon certain reverted and reconveyed lands in the State of Oregon; and

S. 4221. An act for the disposal of combustible refuse from places outside of the city of Washington.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3144. An act to amend section 601 of subchapter 3 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia;